

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. XIII.

October, 1916

No. 4.

SOME DETACHED PAGES FROM THE SECRET
HISTORY OF MODERNISM WITHIN THE
PRECINCTS OF THE VATICAN.

BY PROFESSOR GENNARO SACCARDI, ROME.

The history of the Holy See and of the church should be written with absolute truth on the only just and imperishable principle that the *historica veritas* ought to be supreme, of which we have a divine example in Holy Writ, where the sins, even of Saints, are as openly recorded as the wickedness of sinners.—Leo. XIII.

The Roman Catholic organs have already entirely ceased to occupy themselves with the erstwhile all-engrossing subject of Modernism. A profound silence has succeeded profuse inky and verbal dissertations as to the true significance of the term "Modernism," interpreted by some as a sacrilegious attempt to undermine the divine principles of Christianity, whilst to others on the contrary it synthetised the expurgation of these same principles and gave birth to the hope that the resurrection of the ossified organism of the Roman Catholic church was finally at hand.

There are those who declare emphatically that Modernism is dead, crushed by the iron hand of Pius X, represented on one of the medals struck annually in the Vatican, as the hammer of Modernism. Others again,

the more thoughtful, know the fire is only smouldering, and that the sleeping flame will burst forth again with renewed strength and vigor and with its fiery tongues wreak ruin and desolation in the Roman Curia. Here is, undoubtedly, a grain of truth in the contradictory assertions of both sides of this much discussed question. The judgments now pessimistic, now optimistic, passed upon the subject are formed from the various interpretations attributed to the term "Modernism," which is, undeniably, one of the most unfortunate that has ever been adopted in the history of Christian heterodoxy. For some "Modernism" implies the internal reformation of the Roman Catholic church, the ardent desire of many noble souls who yearn for the purification of Roman Catholicism, and the expurgation from Roman Catholic theology of its doctrinal dross of legends, superstitions, mutilated texts, its patched up criticism, its now partial, now absurd apologetics and its moral laxity. Considered in this sense, Modernism is by no means a doctrinal movement exposed to the light of day by Pius X, and condemned during his pontificate. The history of the Roman Catholic Church has had in every century its Tyrrel and its Loisy, who each in turn, condemned the abuses existent in the Roman Church, like Saint Peter Damian for example. Oftentimes at the sacrifice of their very lives have they continued to labor to that end, and to preach the dire necessity of reforms in the papal hierarchy, as did Arnold of Brescia and Savonarola. At times, like Alvarus Pelagius (1352), in his "*De Planctu Ecclesiae*" in the most touching accents they have deplored the ills of the church and exposed fearlessly its wounds as did Rosmini and Gioberti. Modernism taken in this sense is not dead, and the efforts of Pius X to extirpate its root from the heart of Roman Catholicism have been wholly ineffectual.

A slow but sure propaganda is being made quietly and unostentatiously in the ranks of the lower Roman clergy.

It is detaching them gradually from the hierarchy and making them realize that their future depends upon their abilities to cope with the changed conditions of modern society. A relatively large number of those who take this view of Modernism have lost all hope of the reformation of the Roman Church and have fought and found other ways of realizing their ideals. Some have adopted Protestant beliefs, others have abandoned the ecclesiastical for the secular life. In Italy and in France hundreds of priests have left the priesthood. Many less courageous, having no trade or profession, terrified by the struggle for existence that a total renunciation would entail, remain where they are, though believing no longer in the tenets of the Roman Catholic doctrine. These apparently pusillanimous souls form a very efficient corps of propagandists, and devote their wretched lives to the education and enlightenment of the younger clergy, upon whom they exert a high moral influence.

Modernism may also be understood and considered as a body of doctrines, as a system of old beliefs made new, or to use the words of Pius X as "the modern synthesis of all heresies." In this case, however, paradoxical as our assertion may seem, Modernism recognizes in Pius X its author and its chief. Before his Pontificate, it did not exist as a doctrinal system, embracing in its vast orbit all the branches of ecclesiastical science. There were, without the shadow of a doubt, many gifted Catholics, who each according to his special branch of learning propounded, propagated and defended audacious *novelties*, and that in their researches withdrew from the traditional teachings of the Roman Catholic faith, but their bold doctrines do not merit the title of Modernism. These scholars have only divulged scientific conclusions which bear no resemblance to Modernism, or they have continued the works of scientific criticism inaugurated by their predecessors. To cite an example the exegesis of Loisy is linked with that of Richard Simon who lived in the seventeenth century.

Doctrinal Modernism as the synthesis of the evolution of scientific thought in Catholicism, considered in itself is the product of the ecclesiastical policy of Pius X; considered in its origin, it represents the antitheses between two Pontificates, the fierce struggle between liberal and progressive tendencies and the servile and retrogressive learning of Roman Catholicism. Modernism is the result of the contempt that Pius X, in spite of his much vaunted humility, felt for the pontifical diplomacy of his predecessor. During his reign, Leo XIII was flattered and cajoled, looked upon as a tutelar genius of the Roman Catholic Church. He was vaunted to the very skies for the wisdom of that diplomacy which had subjugated the German iron chancellor. His love for art, his classical culture, the impetus given by the Pontiff to philosophical and biblical research, his attempt to bring about a union between the Greek and Catholic churches, even his longevity were extolled by his hero-worshippers. Most decidedly, Leo XIII merited a great part of the praise lavished so prodigally upon him, but those who would attempt to represent the Pontiff as the great initiator who had led the Roman Catholic Church into hitherto untrodden paths would make a serious mistake, for in truth the much vaunted liberalism of Leo XIII confined itself strictly within the limits of the most rigid orthodoxy. During his Pontificate, there were documents and condemnations to which Pius X in spite of his blatant scorn for the policy pursued by his predecessor, would have most cheerfully subscribed, for instance, the document which denies the validity of Anglican ordinations, the condemnation of Americanism, and the putting on the Index the works of Hermann Schell.

Leo XIII, unlike his successor, was a diplomatist *par excellence*. He was averse to the application of violent measures, and acted always with the greatest discretion and prudence. He prodigally allowed the lower clergy the greatest possible liberty in the promotion of social

works, and strange to say, it was precisely on the question of these very social works, that the first discordant note was struck between the ultra-conservative clergy, composed almost entirely of bishops who had succeeded in attaining to the dignity by paltry intrigues of every imaginable description, and canons accustomed to an easy life, and the tendencies, on the other hand, of the clergy inclined to liberalism, and open to the reception of new ideas. These last were to be found in great number in the ranks of the young priests.

Pius X, whether we consider him as Bishop of Mantua, Cardinal Sarto of Venice, or as the successor of Leo XIII impersonates the retrogressive party of the Italian clergy. His education was and always remained absolutely rudimentary. Going over his private papers, his enthusiastic admirers succeeded in unearthing but one solitary distich in honor of St. Louis of Gonzaga. These two simple verses are the only heredity of the classical culture of Pius X left to posterity. His profound ignorance of any language save his own, naturally left him in an equally profound ignorance of the sources of true ecclesiastical culture. Cardinal Merry del Val, we are told, did try to initiate the venerable Pontiff in the mysteries of French. We should prefer to waive the question, however, as to whether the eminent Spanish Cardinal better as *maitre de francais* of his Pope, or as his Secretary of State. The ideal of Pius X of an impeccable priesthood was reached, when chastity was rigorously observed, liturgical functions scrupulously enacted to the letter—the spirit seems to have been a secondary consideration—in the recitation of miles of vocal prayers, the careful reading of a strictly Catholic newspaper, the gastronomic joys, in reason, be it well understood, of the kitchen, and by way of recreation, a perfectly innocuous game of cards.

He considered the social activity of the clergy as a sort of moral depravation resulting from the revolutionary spirit of the times while his Satanic majesty was infalli-

bly at the bottom of any study necessitating in its pursuit the use of critical methods. For Pius X the whole of Christianity was contained in the catechism, and there was not the slightest reason for the clergy to search after light, after principles other than those laid down in this *Vade mecum* of every good Christian.

On one occasion, some one spoke to Pius X of the necessity of habituating the people to read the Gospels themselves. The good Pontiff answered textually that the reading of the Bible "does more harm than good to the people, because it accustoms them to a too free examination, and as a consequence to individual interpretation." It is a well-known fact that he paralyzed the Society of Saint Jerome, which had succeeded in a comparatively short time, in circulating in Italy 300,000 copies of the New Testament, translated into Italian and annotated according to the interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church. There was nothing reprehensible in the notes of the above mentioned translation, but Pius X was displeased because they had been compiled by a learned priest who lived "in the odour of Modernism," Father Ginocchi.

Less well-known is the typical and characteristic response given to Don Salvatore Minocchi who in a private audience granted by the Pontiff during the early times of his Pontificate spoke freely to the Pope of his Biblical studies: "You," said Pope Pius X, "work so assiduously and so radically upon the Bible that in a very short time nothing will be left of it but the binding."

Although he had lived in a city chanted in all ages and climes for its incomparable treasures of art, the former Patriarch of Venice considered the study of the *Beaux Arts* as the useless luxury of idle pleasure-seekers. When Mgr. Bartolini, *custos* of the Arcadia (Roman Academy) presented the Holy Father with the diploma of membership in the Academy, the Pope said half-jokingly and half-seriously: "Poetry! poetry! Why don't you think a little about studying the catechism?"

A great fuss was made about the reservation of a few rooms in the Vatican, in which to preserve the famous pictures of the papal gallery, and there were those who attempted to represent the Pontiff as a Mecenat of the fine arts. The fact that Pius X had relegated the precious paintings of Raphael and Domenichino to the most inaccessible part of the Vatican near the Papal stables, to protect himself and his quarters from the continuous influx of foreigners who previously had been accustomed to invade the Loggia before entering the Pinacoteca, was completely lost sight of.

His love for books was so very unexaggerated that during the entire ten years of his Pontificate, he is known to have visited once only the great Vatican library, and he reduced very considerably the funds hitherto assigned to Leo XIII for the acquisition of new books, and at the same time reduced also the salaries of the employes of the library. A propos of the astronomical observatory founded by his predecessor, Pius X was wont to say laughingly: "It is a costly little tower erected more for the examination of glow worms than for the contemplation of the stars."

If we consider and understand clearly the hostile attitude of Pius X towards science and scientists we realize that there is nothing surprising about the fact that in the bottom of his heart he felt a profound contempt towards learned and active priests. Encouraged by Leo XIII, the clergy founded Catholic banks, rural saving banks, Catholic newspapers, and organized Catholic circles and congresses. Don Romolo Murri, who was, during the Pontificate of Leo XIII, the life and soul of the young Catholic movements, and who, by means of his newspaper, *Il Domani d'Italia*, exercised a very powerful and highly beneficial influence upon the seminarian clergy, was the object of a special antipathy on the part of Pius X. In fact the animosity of the Pope was so persistent and so violent that Murri, who had worked miracles under the Pontifi-

cate of Leo XIII, was finally forced to abandon the church for which he had been an indefatigable worker for many years.

The social Catholicism of Cardinal Sarto, a Catholicism based entirely upon the recitation of the Rosary, the making of pilgrimages, and in a blind obedience to hierarchical authority had its echo and faithful representative in the Venetian Count Paganuzzi. There was naturally ceaseless friction between the retrogressive ideas of Paganuzzi, and the theories of Murri, with regard to the work carried on by the Italian Catholic Congresses. Cardinal Sarto had taken under his wing his *alter idem* Count Paganuzzi, and as a consequence, he was relatively unjust and hostile to the common enemy, Don Romolo Murri, and used terms highly derogatory to the character of the last. Don Romolo Murri very naturally resented the injustice and wrote a tempestuous letter to Cardinal Rampolla, then in the zenith of his power. Murri triumphed, and Cardinal Sarto never forgave the young ecclesiastic for the humiliation of his defeat.

The implacable war ever afterwards waged against Murri, and the inflexible reserve which the Pope always maintained in his dealings with Cardinal Rampolla find their *raison d'être* not in the ardent zeal of the Pontiff to preserve in their integrity the doctrines of the Roman Church, but in the personal animosity nourished and kept warm in the heart of the Pope for the two who had so grievously offended him. Viewed under this aspect the late Pontiff realized in his person, the full meaning of the saying in vogue amongst the catholic clergy: *Homo homini lupus; mulier mulieri lupior; sacerdos catholicus sacerdoti catholico lupissimus.*

When Cardinal Sarto became Pope, he reaped the inheritance of one of the greatest Popes in the Roman church. No higher praise could have been bestowed upon Leo XIII, and the praise was lavished by his admirers as well as by his adversaries, than that contained in the

phrase: "A Modern Pope!" This epithet, "modern," fell harshly upon the retrogressive ears of his successor, who considered Leo XIII as a Pope who had falsified the true spirit of Roman Catholicism.

Surrounded by his intimates he never failed to speak of Leo XIII in terms anti-complimentary: "A Utopian! The negation of practical common sense." He believed himself, by the grace of God, to have been chosen to heal the wounds inflicted upon Catholicism by the excessive liberalism of Leo XIII. His most bitter condemnation was for *Il Papa moderno*, and thus was the term *Modernist* chosen, in order to ostracize the tendencies and the initiative of the Leonine Pontificate.

Merry del Val and his satellites, before the epithet "Modernism" had been put into circulation, facetiously used the terms *Leoniani* and *Rampolliani* to signify that the new heresy was not other than the synthesis of the Pontificate of *Il Papa moderno*.

This hostility of Pius X towards the modern spirit of Leo XIII assumed very rabid proportions. All those who had been favored by his predecessor, and who had labored according to his instructions were exiled from the Vatican, and hunted and spied upon as Modernists. The adversaries and defamers of Leo XIII were, on the contrary, taken into favor and loaded with esteem and honors. One of the most typical episodes of this anti-modernist papal persecution is the following:

Father Mattiussi Jesuit, an indefatigable fame-hunter, whose ignorance is only excelled by his inordinate ambition, was chosen as the orator at Bergamo, presided over by the bishop of the diocese, Monsignor Radini-Tedeschi, and attended by two hundred priests. During his oratorical fire-works, Father Mattiussi inveighed against Leo XIII, dubbing him publicly as a "malefic star" of the Church of Christ. The scandal such an unheard of proceeding evoked was great. Bishop Radini-Tedeschi marched out of the Congressional hall, and the next day

betook himself to Rome where he requested an immediate audience with the Pope, and in piping hot terms denounced Father Mattiussi as an insulter of Leo XIII. Pius X unhesitatingly declared the Bishop's protest just and promised to call to order the Jesuit, and muzzle the *Unità Cattolica*, a clerical organ of Florence which approved his speech. Bishop Radini-Tedeschi was overjoyed at his success and remained in Rome to wait the fulfillment of the papal promises. The indignation and chagrin of the worthy Bishop may well be conceived when two days after his most satisfactory audience with Pius X, the *Unità Cattolica* published a highly flattering telegram from *Il Santo Padre*, congratulating the editor, and urging a continuance of the fight against ecclesiastical modernism. Father Mattiussi, the defamer of Leo XIII, was with a *Motu-Proprio* of the Pope called to the Gregorian University to succeed Cardinal Billot in the chair of dogmatic theology. The most amusing part of the story is that the entire theological baggage of Mattiussi consists of an amorphous treatise on "The Kantian poison."

Another French ex-Jesuit, l'abbé Bourbier, to the intense delight of the intimates of Pius X published an indigestible work in two volumes, on the Pontificate of Leo XIII, in which "*Il Papa Moderno*" is represented as the secret head of Free-Masonry, and the destroyer of the Church of Christ. The violence of the language was such that the work was put on the Index, but the author had honors and material aid from the Vatican.

During the earlier years of his Pontificate, in his struggle to annihilate Modernism the chief aim of Pius X was to cancel every trace of the policy of his predecessor. In this respect, he succeeded so well, that according to the Modernists, in him was fulfilled to the letter the false prophecy of Malachias attributed to his reign. Pius X was truly an *ignis ardens* that destroyed everything, and prepared to his successor the Pontificate of the *religio depopulata*.

The greatest part of the documents drawn up during the Pontificate of Pius X, were written with the express purpose of obliterating entirely or changing ostensibly the policy pursued by Leo XIII, thus confirming the truth of the Italian saying: "That which one Pope does, the other undoes."

Congressional movements, Catholic circles, rural banks, Christian democracy, the organization of seminaries, Biblical commissions, Catholic periodicals, attempts to bring about a union of the churches, the organization of Roman Congregations, liturgical feasts, scientific institutions, literary academies, all that had been founded, approved of, or developed under Leo XIII was either hopelessly muddled or entirely suppressed.

The so-called liturgical reforms either eliminated or reduced to an inferior rank the feast dearest to the heart of Leo XIII, whose name occurs often in the legends of the Breviary, on account of the great number of saints canonized during his Pontificate. The Leonine Seminary was virtually suppressed by the so-called Seminarian Reforms and the hatred of the "Modern Pope" was so intense in the entourage of Pius X that the very gifts sent to Leo XIII from all parts of the world on the occasion of his Pontifical Jubilee were either dispersed or heaped up in the subterranean chambers of the Vatican. Even the gardens of the Apostolic palace were victims of the burning winds of hate that swept through the new Pontificate. Groves and vines planted by Leo XIII were uprooted by the order of Pius X who even destroyed the simulacrum of a zoölogical garden instituted by his predecessor.

These manifestations of hatred against Leo XIII were so apparent that the Christian Democrats, who had been disavowed by the Vatican clique, in order to arouse the ire of the reigning Pontiff, celebrated each year with great pomp and eloquent panegyrics the anniversary of

the death of Leo XIII, and thousands of copies of the encyclical of "*Il Papa Moderno*," on the labor question were distributed gratis.

Pius X claimed that the ideas of his predecessor on the Democratic movement were plagiarized from the theories of Lamennais, the great Roman Catholic apostate, condemned under the Pontificate of Gregory XVI. The destruction of every initiative taken by Leo XIII was not enough to satisfy these rabid anti-Leonini. Pius X and his clique aimed at the defamation of the Leonine pontificate which they considered as a period of culpable indifference towards the maintenance of the integral purity of Catholic orthodoxy, of doctrinal anarchy against which the dead Pontiff had hesitated to act for fear of compromising his popularity. In condemning "Modernism," the Vatican anti-modernists put Leo XIII on the same level with Honorius I (625-638), of whom Pope Leo II wrote in a dogmatical letter to the ecumenical council of Constantinople (680): "We anathematize Honorius, who did not attempt to sanctify this Apostolic Church, with the teachings of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery permitted its purity to be polluted."

The anti-modern Vatican clique did not consider Modernism as so much the result of the direct teachings of Leo XIII and cardinal Rampolla, as the logical result of their united mis-government of the Roman Catholic Church. The eighth of September, 1907, marks a culminating point in the Pontificate of Pius X. In the fifth year of his Apostolic reign, he finally, after much laborious thought, *signed* officially the *Magna Charta* of Modernism, the Encyclical *Pascendi*. We say "*affixed* his signature," because the Encyclical is not the erudite production of the pen of Pius X. *A priori*, it is inadmissible that a man whose entire classical literary luggage is represented by a solitary Latin distich, and a few unctuous "Vangelini" could have conceived and evolved a synthesis of the doctrinal results of modern scientific thought.

The only Encyclical for which Pius X is wholly personally responsible is that written for the centenary of Saint Charles Borromeo, which aroused intense feeling in Germany, on account of the injurious terms woven throughout the verbal texture against Protestantism. Had the text been sent as it was written by the undiplomatic pen of Pius X, this adverse criticism would have been trebly intense: but the Pontiff gave the Encyclical to Father Angelini, a learned Jesuit, to be construed into Latin, and the good Father afterwards declared to a friend that he had been obliged to reduce the violent invectives against the Lutherans to at least one-third of the original number.

The Encyclical *Pascendi* is a collective work. Its paternity is ascribed by many to Cardinal Billot, a theologian of the most dry scholastic type, who consecrated his declining intellect to the task of producing the most childish, insipid pamphlets on the "Immutability of Dogma," that have ever seen the light of day.

It is a well-known fact, however, that Cardinal Billot never read anything but the ancient scholastics: he was absolutely ignorant of exegetics, and afflicted with an unbounded horror of all modern ecclesiastical literature.

There are others who believe the Encyclical to have been the dual work of a versatile prelate who had a lengthy hour of doubtful celebrity during the Pontificate of Leo XIII, Monsignor Umberto Benigni, and the Belgian Benedictine, Don Lorenzo Janssens, an indefatigable scribbler of gigantic commentaries of Saint Thomas, and one of those monks who, to use clerical jargon, were afflicted with the *mania mitrite*. He would undoubtedly have succeeded in crowning his learned head with the red hat of the Cardinal, if an untimely visit to President Roosevelt in Rome, and the Spanish jealousy of Merry del Val, had not unexpectedly put an end to his curial aspirations. By his melifluous conferences, Father Janssens had become the idol of the Roman feminine aristoc-

racy. Cardinal Merry del Val, who had hitherto reigned supreme over the Roman patrician female mind became greatly exercised as he saw the circle of his petticoated admirers gradually diminishing. Hence the downfall of the Belgian Benedictine. Although we cannot positively assert the fact, it is more than probable that the two scholars above cited were charged to furnish the materials grouped together in the *Pascendi* Encyclical.

The practical measures adopted to uproot Modernism, which measures seem to have been made, I quote Albert Ehrhard, "to dry up the scientific roots of Roman Catholicism," bear the visible impress of the genius genre "Sherlock Holmes" of Cardinal Gætano De Lai.

The publication of the Encyclical *Pascendi* brought only bitterness and disillusion to Pius X. That nation which, above all others, had furnished the scientific substratum of Modernism, Germany, refused categorically to apply the practical measures advocated therein. Even in Rome, a few weeks after the melancholy denouement of the *Pascendi*, the "Programme of the Modernists" saw the light of day. Said programme was a psychological document of great value, drawn up with rare energy of style, great force of conviction and profound scientific knowledge. It was a well-known fact that six ecclesiastics had collaborated towards the evolution of the programme. Of the six, the names of Ernesto Buonaiuti, Umberto Fracassini, and Antonio De Stefano were whispered on all sides. Pius X hurled an excommunication *maggior*e, from which he alone had the power to absolve them, against the anonymous authors of the Programme. In order to be freed from the interdiction, the culprits were summoned to reveal their names to the Pope, but these last, notwithstanding their excommunication continued to celebrate the liturgical rites. The maledictions of the Pope had no power to move the six scholarly authors of the master-piece from their settled determination to reform the interior policy of the Roman Church.

The *Pascendi* Encyclical on the one hand established the doctrinal position of "the domestic reformers" of the Roman Catholicism, on the other it gave birth to a sort of "Pharisaism," among the least zealous and most ignorant in the ranks of the Roman clergy. Before the appearance of the Encyclical, Catholic scholars like Duchesne, Loisy, Semeria, Minocchi, by their profound studies and laborious researches, exposed the true origins of the old ecclesiastical legends, infused new life and vitality into Catholic thought, and gave a more powerful impetus to Biblical and historical criticism. After the publication of the Programme, Duchesne and his *confreres* were proclaimed and declared *corifei* of Modernism. About the same time, several men saw in Modernism their opportunity to reach "the land of plenty" and to emerge into a sort of doubtful popularity by playing upon the intemperate zeal, the affability and the total diplomatic inexperience of the Pope.

They began by making the Pontiff believe that he had been expressly chosen by God to repair the ills wrought in the church by a too worldly and diplomatic Pope. The next step was to convince the all-too-credulous Pope that God had likewise endowed him with the gift of working miracles. La "Croix" of Paris, published on several occasions accounts of miraculous healing performed by simple contact with the white skull-cap of the Pope, or even by his apostolic benediction. A newspaper in Innsbruck related that Monsignor Bisleti, upon entering the Pope's chamber early in the morning saw the Pontiff suspended in the air at a height of at least two metres from his bed. The Poles divulged weird tales of miraculous bi-location, due to the power of the Pontifical *taumaturgo*, while the Sisters Riparatrici (nuns who had charge of the personal linen of Pius X) began to sell at forty lire the pair socks that had touched the miraculous flesh of the Pontiff.

The fame of Pius X as a worker of miracles became so well-known abroad that when the Cardinal Archbishop

Pflüg of Vienna, fell dangerously ill, the Arch-duchess Valeria wrote an urgent letter to the Pope imploring him as *taumaturgo* to restore to health the dying prelate. The flattery of the Pope's entourage was so efficacious that Pius X began seriously to believe in the miracles attributed to him. He gave, however, due credit to the Most High who had endowed his hands with a miraculous power. His faith in his own infallibility became boundless. Even when speaking to children he used constantly his favorite expression: "Jesus speaks with my lips." As his mysticism increased immeasurably, so did his hatred of the Modernists, who were opposed to his teaching and whose pride prevented their believing in his infallibility.

There were times when his hatred assumed such proportions that he could no longer control himself. He would walk agitatedly up and down his chamber, muttering from time to time: "Li schiaccio, li schiaccio—(I crush them)." Most certainly had he lived in the days of Pius V, and had he inherited the papal throne, he would like his ancient predecessor, enrolled on the list of saints, have filled the prisons with riotous Modernists, and enlightened the minds obscured by scientific mists, by the application of Inquisitorial tortures.

Anti-modernism was the direct result of the systematized Modernism of Pius X, and a sort of Pharisaism which a witty Prelate defined: *Animal cervicosum et rabidum, sua commoda quaerens cum damno tertii sub specie pietatis*. Its chiefs and diplomatists were three Cardinals who constituted an inquisitorial triumvirate under the Pontificate of Pius X.

Their names are well-known and no doubt will be handed down to posterity, like that of Torquemada. The Pontificate of Pius X was in reality that of three Cardinals: Merry del Val, Gætano De Lai, and Vives y Tuto. The sarcastic wit of the Italians united these three names in a very concise sort of pasquinade: "The Vatican is a Val (vale) of Lai (lamentations) because Vives e tuto (all)."

In the history of Modernism, Vives y Tuto is the mystic; Del Val, the diplomatist, and De Lai, the bailiff. Note that two of these cardinals are Spanish, and that Pastor in one of his volumes of the "History of the Popes," writes that Spanish Pontificates *e. g.* the Borgia, were always fatal to the Papacy.

Vives y Tuto a Capuchin and a mystic, was, during his life, the confessor and moral counsellor of the Pope. His literary mania consisted in writing compendiums on theology, canon law and hermeneutics and in collecting texts and prayers of the Fathers of the church. He shunned all scientific works as he would have dodged the plague. His mysticism consisted in passing hours of contemplative immobility in the church and in a withdrawal from the lives led in Christian society. As Prefect of the Congregations of Religions, with laws Draconian in their severity, he prohibited the members of monastic orders to come in contact with modern thought, and excluded from monasteries books, periodicals and newspapers, which were most strictly Roman (*quanquam optima*).

The constancy with which Pius X waged war against Modernism is due entirely to his suggestions for it was Vives y Tuto who drafted the Code.

One fine day the news spread that the saintly Confessor of the Pope had lost his reason. There were times when Cardinal Vives believed himself to be the Pope. He wrote decrees and signed his name to them. Then again he would break forth into the most piteous lamentations, because by his counsels he had ruined the church and caused Pius X to tread the wrong paths. Sometimes during the night he would arise, and extend himself naked on the floor of the Capuchin monastery, where he lived when in Rome. His attacks of madness were at times so violent that even the united efforts of four of his confreres were not sufficient to control the mad prelate who was taken to a cottage near Genzano, and there after one of his violent attacks, he died after having received the apostolic benediction of Pius X.

The diplomatist of anti-modernism was Cardinal Merry del Val. It was rumored in the Vatican, that the eminent Secretary of State never read a book of any description, to be cited as the most skillful sportsman in the Eternal City. "*L' Illustrazione Italiana*" published photographs of His Eminence as an expert marksman, aiming to strike the Bull's Eye with unalterable precision in a villa on Monte Mario, where he passed the summer months. The "*Giornale d'Italia*," whose relations with the Vatican are very much more intimate than were those of the strictly clerical newspapers published most amusing accounts of the Cardinal's marvelous skill as a fisherman, and declared that the Secretary of State had caught trout weighing eight pounds. In Bolsena the reporters of the same newspaper were never weary of dilating upon Cardinal Merry del Val's wonderful ease in the water of the lake, under which he could swim with the grace and dexterity of a veritable fish. The official dinners of the Spanish Secretary of State were famous. Among the letters written to the celebrated Monsignor Montagnini, Secretary of the Papal Nunciature in France, letters which were, as is very well-known, sequestered by the French government, was one from Monsignor Bressan, private Secretary to Pius X, in which the Reverend Father implored his friend Montagnini to send, *addressed to him*, a generous supply of old French cognac. "This precaution is absolutely necessary," wrote Bressan, "because all the edibles and drinkables sent directly to the Pope find their way to the fathomless store rooms of Merry del Val."

If we consider the Cardinal Secretary of State as an efficient sportsman, and an enemy to all intellectual culture, we must agree that Merry del Val cannot be cited as a competent authority on the all-important questions of Modernism. But in Monsignor Benigni, ex-editor of the Roman journal "*La Voce della Verita*," ex-professor in the seminary of Propaganda, ex-modernist who after-

wards became the most rabid among the anti-modernists for purely economical reasons, and ex-employee of the Vatican library, Merry del Val found just the man he needed to do the work which would cause the inexperienced Pope to look upon his secretary as the skillful unmasker of Modernistic plots. Clerical and Modernist organs alike painted Benigni in the most unbecoming colors. The "Augsburger Postzeitung" accused him of being a free-mason secretly, while an eminent French Bishop declared that the new tool of the Papal Secretary had wrought more evil to Catholicism in three years than a whole army of free-masons in twenty-five years.

Before the Pontificate of Pius X, Benigni lived in misery. He published a small periodical entitled, "Miscellanea di Storia ecclesiastica," in which he wrote of Duchesne in glowing terms. Just as soon, however, as he scented contrary winds in the *Nuovo Pontificato*, Benigni changed his tactics, and became the official modernist spy of the Vatican. Cardinal Merry del Val raised him to the honor of sub-secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Affairs. Said promotion was due indirectly to Merry del Val's abhorrence for the reading of books and documents. Benigni became the right hand man of the Papal Secretary by writing daily a condensed list of the complicated questions likely to arise in Papal diplomacy, in the history of which the eminent Cardinal will be handed down to posterity as the incomparable perpetrator of "gaffes diplomatiques." By the means of the above mentioned list the illustrious prelate could decide the most important questions without infringing upon the time ordinarily dedicated to his favorite sports. The solution adopted for the solving of whatever diplomatic problem was invariably that proposed by the now indispensable Benigni.

Shortly after Benigni's entrance into the Vatican clique a one page journal appeared entitled "La Corrispondenza Romana." From very humble beginnings of

a circulation of about fifteen hundred copies, "La Correspondenza Romana" speedily became the principal organ of attacks against undeclared Modernists, and the revelation of Modernistic plots. The fame of the sheet increased immediately when its founder and director labelled it as the official organ of the Secretary of State. Then it became the terror of the clergy. The means employed by Benigni in editing his journal was to choose spies, principally laymen, in the chief cities of the different countries, and to obtain through them news concerning the private life, the tendencies, and above all any immoral escapades in the lives of the bishops and other distinguished members of the Catholic clergy. In this way Benigni succeeded in having a complete dossier of the bishops and prelates of all the dioceses and, according to his own personal antipathies, the "Corrispondenza Romana" defamed them each in turn. The theological Faculty of the University of Fribourg, and the Catholic Institute of Toulouse were fiercely attacked by the paper of Benigni. The rectors and professors of the above mentioned universities were represented as men corrupted by the errors of Modernism. A professor of French literature in the University of Lille was denounced as a Modernist because in one of his poems he spoke of the soul in things, an assertion claimed by the anti-Modernists, as being decidedly pantheistic.

In the struggle against the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, Monsignor Benigni had a very energetic collaborator in the correspondent of the *Action Française*, the atheistic clerical organ of the French royalists. This correspondent was the *Missus Dominicus* of Cardinal Merry del Val, who confided to him his messages for the chiefs of the French legitimist party. The collaborator of Benigni used the pseudonym of Aventinus. The *Bulletin de l'Institut Catholique* of Toulouse taking the matter seriously and believing the correspondent of the "*Action Française*" to be a prelate, published articles in self-defense

against the insinuations of Monsignor Benigni and the French journalist. It was finally discovered that Aventinus was a very insignificant scribbler who had never been inside a Catholic Church, but believed firmly in *Metempsychosis*, and guarded two superb Angora cats with jealous care as reincarnation forms of distant ancestors. "*La Corrispondenza Romana*" startled the whole Catholic world by its wholesale denunciations of Cardinals and Bishops said to be imbued with the spirit of Modernism. Benigni, however, as the protégé of Merry del Val was invulnerable. The protests raised by the German bishops of whom the swellers in the Vatican have an unholy fear, were so violent and so frequent that Pius X, much against his will, was obliged to relieve his favorite of his official duties in the Vatican. He allowed him, however, to retain the honorary title of Monsignor and provided him with a generous income. "*La Corrispondenza Romana*" soon afterwards shared the fate of its founder and editor, whom Pius X called laughingly the "*Grande Inquisitore*."

To Benigni is due the discovery of the so-called "*plot of the Index*," an attempt made by the German Catholics to obtain reforms in the legislation of the Congregation of the Index, and of the plot of the Roman ecclesiastics, which gave rise to the famous law-suit, the principal figure in which was the young priest, Ernesto Buoniauti, now professor of the History of Religions in the Roman University. Like his famous protector, Cardinal Merry del Val, Monsignor Benigni has fallen into obscurity, to enjoy the respectable fortune accumulated during the reign of terror caused by the defamation of priests and prelates in his "*Corrispondenza Romana*." Cardinal Merry del Val has likewise laid down his arms, and is taking a little needed rest after his battle against Modernism and the Modernists. He realized at the opportune moment that the fight against Modernism would end with the death of Pius X. To the sum to which he was en-

titled as Secretary of State, which was said to amount to 100,000 lire, he added that due to him as Secretary of the Congregation of Brefs, which netted him 60,000 lire yearly. A short time before the death of Pius X he was appointed arch-priest of the Basilica of St. Peter, at an annual income of 30,000 lire. To Modernism, at least, may be attributed the merit of placing economically *à l'abri* one member of the prolific Spanish noble families, dedicated heart and soul to the cult of the Holy See, as were also in their day the Caesars and the Valentini Borgia. In order to illustrate more clearly how the war against the Modernists was conducted, allow me to relate a most amusing anecdote. One of the homes of the Scolopi (friars devoted to the education of children) in the Roman Province was inhabited by six old monks, scrupulous and fanatical beyond measure, and strictly orthodox readers of the "*Unità Cattolica*." The six good Fathers were unitedly opposed to the introduction of any project that would end by the changing of the old order of things for the men. A young monk was sent to be the Father Superior of the orthodox six. The young friar did not like the rabid fanaticism of his confreres, so in order to get rid of his uncomfortable subjects, he denounced the six friars to the Cardinal Secretary of State as Modernists of the most virulent type. Two days after having sent his denunciatory letter to Merry del Val, the Father General of the Scolopi received a letter from the Secretary of State enjoining to transfer the six culprits to another home of the same order. The General immediately obeyed, although justly astonished at the severity of the measures taken against the six venerable friars. A short time after, the denunciator of the rabid anti-modernists indiscreetly revealed his identity as the author of the practical joke, and the Father General of the Scolopi had finally the key to the mysterious enigma.

The bailiff or the gendarme of Modernism was Cardinal Gaetano De Lai, who became the very incarnation of

the Anti-Modernism, and so vigorously did he hunt down the Modernists, and more suspected of Modernistic tendencies, that *L'Italie* changed the epithet of Modernism to *Laisme*, or Pharisaism *Laiano*.

Gaetano De Lai, a humble, uneducated priest in the diocese of Vicenza, owed his Cardinal's hat to the personal friendship of Pius X. For the anti-modern Pope, during his Pontificate, took unlimited pains to provide the Venetians whom he had known intimately before his accession to the Papal throne with dioceses and ecclesiastical benefices. Under his Pontificate, as wittily said Monsignor Duchesne, "la barque de Saint Pierre se transforma en gondole venitienne."

To Cardinal De Lai may be attributed in a great measure the changes wrought in the Roman Curia in the year 1908, by the *Sapienti Consilio* constitution. Said truly *Sapiente* upheaval in the Roman Curia brought de Lai to the very apex of ecclesiastical power. As Secretary of the Congregation of the Consistory, enlarged at the expense of the Congregation of the Propaganda, De Lai had in reality entire control over the whole Roman Catholic Hierarchy, the Secretary of this Congregation being the arbitrator in the election of bishops and the general inspector of the Seminaries.

Modernism furnished De Lai with the very opportunity he desired to form an Episcopate according to his views, and to reform the seminaries by transforming them into dens of denunciators and calumniators. To him may also be attributed the war waged against the celebrated French critic and historian, Monsignor Duchesne, which terminated in the condemnation of his book, the *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*. Some day, when the documents saved from the tempest of Modernism are published, the fact will be made known that it was by the express desire of Pius X that the work of Duchesne was translated into Italian. The Pope is even quoted as having remarked when speaking of the *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*: "That is the way to write history."

De Lai also forbade the seminarians to read the works of Semeria, Krüger, Funk, and Delehay, the learned Bollandist accused by the uneducated prelate of writing in a spirit hostile to that of the Holy Roman Catholic Church. The result of said prohibition was to deprive the seminarians of printed text-books of Church History. As a consequence the professors were obliged to dictate the lessons from carefully expurgated editions. De Lai also abolished in the seminaries the reading of newspapers and periodicals, *quanquam optima*, as the best books oftentimes arouse an ardent desire to read bad ones, that is to say, those infected with Modernism. The ideal seminary, according to him, should be like a Buddhist temple, served by lymphatic youths accustomed to the Nirvana. The rectors of the various seminaries were commanded to open all letters addressed to professors in their respective seminaries, for the purpose of discovering if they were in sympathy with suspected modern ecclesiastics. The pupils in like manner were requested to make note of the expression of sentiments by their unsuspecting teachers and to report all such to the rector of the seminary. By means of this system of ignoble espionage many ecclesiastical careers were ruined. Pupils who had failed to pass their examination revenged themselves oftentimes upon their teachers by denouncing them as Modernists, or at least having Modernistic tendencies. The seminary of Perugia founded by Leo XIII was suppressed and the bishop of the diocese, Monsignor Gentili, who was virtually deposed, died of a broken heart.

To Cardinal De Lai's machinations may also be traced the war waged under the pretext of Modernism against Cardinal Ferrari of Milan, one of the most zealous bishops in the Roman Church. The persecution of which the high-minded prelate was the object, was due principally to the jealousy existing between the ignorant anti-Italian pro-Austrian Venetian clergy, to which Pius X and Cardinal De Lai belonged, and the Lombardian ecclesiastics,

the most intellectual, refined and patriotic to be found in the ranks of the Italian clergy. In his organ "*La Riscossa*," De Lai publicly accused Cardinal Ferrari of Modernistic tendencies. The tools of the prelate were editors of insignificant newspapers and worthless periodicals, who under the pretext of fighting Modernism defamed and calumniated the most learned members of the Roman clergy. Against them, even the prudent Jesuits of the "*Etudes de la Compagnie de Jésus*," and the "*Stimmen aus Maria Laach*" having lost their patience, were violent in their recriminations. The virulent campaign was conducted principally by the "*Unita Cattolica*" of Florence, a petty journal of no more than a thousand subscribers, and towards the maintenance of which Pius X donated 30,000 francs annually. The director chosen by the Pope was a priest who had been expelled from the Carmelite Order and two seminaries. Obligated to renounce the management of the "*Unita Cattolica*" on account of several lawsuits instituted against him by the civil tribunal for defamation of character, he was succeeded by Don Cavallanti, an arrogant priest who published an index of the Modernists, and those suspected of having Modernistic tendencies, which contained vulgar attacks against Père Lagrange, Monsignor Duchesne, and other equally eminent scholars in the ranks of the Catholic clergy. Another defamatory periodical the "*Sentinella Modernista*" was afterwards added to the celebrated Index, in which appeared the names of priests accused of receiving obscene magazines, and to the intense horror of the faithful, wore short cassocks. The Bishop of Montefiascone issued a circular containing five invectives against the "*modernizzianti*" priests, who no longer wore silver buckles on their shoes.

The third on the list of anti-modernist organs was the "*Riscossa*" of Braganza.

The director of the last named weekly was Monsignor Scotton, the *alter idem* of De Lai, and the cherished friend

of Pius X. The "Riscossa" related that when the venerable Pontiff was a modest parish-priest, he carried Scotton's valise to the station. Assisted by his sister, a little old woman who sold the church wicks that persistently refused to be lit, Monsignor Scotton by means of the "Riscossa" began to fight the Modernists and very shortly became known as the famous discoverer of a new and startling heresy *Episcopalism*. Under this new heresy were designated all those who asserted that the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church had powers of jurisdiction in their dioceses according to their rank. Scotton and his adherents claimed that there is only one Bishop in the Church of Jesus Christ who exercises his authority over the whole Catholic Hierarchy through his delegates. The famous expression of Pius IX, *La Chiesa son io*, was paraphrased incessantly in the "Riscossa." The opponents of the Episcopalism sustained that as Jesus is always present in the Holy Eucharist, according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so is the Holy Spirit perpetually present in the soul of the Pope.

The Triumvirate of the above named Cardinals is responsible for all the errors and spiritual ruin, wrought under the standard of Modernism during the Pontificate of Pius X. Merry del Val and De Lai vied with each other in removing from the entourage of the Pope, those cardinals who by their great learning and virtue, caused them to be overshadowed. That they succeeded in their evil intent is only too well known. Cardinal Rampolla did not go to the Vatican more than ten times during the Pontificate of Pius X, and Cardinal Ferrata, the eminent diplomatist was excluded from taking any part in the government of the Catholic Church. On one occasion the latter gave expression to his pent-up feelings by remarking that "The Vice-devil reigned supreme in the Vatican instead of the Vice-God." The irreverent expression was immediately reported to the Pontiff who commanded the venerable prelate to make a spiritual retreat in the convent of the Sisters of the Sacred Heart at Grottaferrata.

The open-minded liberal Cardinal Agliardi was the *bête noire* of Merry del Val. Many and frequent were the squabbles between the two for the episcopal jurisdiction over Castel Gandolfo, the palace determined by the Italian government as the summer residence of the Popes, and a parish in the diocese of Albano. Because Cardinal Agliardi dared to speak frankly to the Pope about Merry del Val, he was exiled from the Vatican for three months. Many other Cardinals preferring peace to war refrained from frequenting the Apostolic Palace as the Triad reigned supreme.

Pius X passed his days giving audience from morn till eve to nuns, newly-wedded couples, Venetian families and priests, tourists of all races and nations, and First Communicants. Prelates and scholars were less popular and thus had much more difficulty in obtaining access to the Holy Father. Fregoli, the celebrated Italian impersonator (*Transformista*) was summoned on one occasion and delighted the hearts and souls of the *piccolo mondo* of the Vatican by certain little scenes a trifle daring in their spiciness. The Pope was horrified at the unwonted proceeding and rated his prelate of the Papal chamber as being principally responsible for the adventure. He concluded his tirade with the words: "By and by you will finish by pushing the devil into my room."

The whole ten years of the Pontificate of Pius X were passed in waging war against the Modernists, and in granting audiences from morn till night to flatterers and hero-worshippers. Today all is calm, relatively speaking, at the helm of the Roman Catholic Church. Merry del Val and De Lai are silent on the subject of Modernism and are enjoying an unmerited rest after their stirring Modernistic campaign. The awful heresy of the Episcopatism, crushed by Pius X, and combatted by the "Riscossa" of Braganza and the "Difesa" of Venice has been declared by Benedict XV as an integrally Catholic doctrine. The epithets *papalists* and *integralists* which the

rabid anti-modernists wished to add to the title of Roman Catholics have been abolished by the will of the reigning Pontiff. Monsignor Scotton, the energetic pioneer of anti-modernism has ceased to portray the dim horrors of the Episcopatism.

History written by an impartial hand will one day reveal the dark side of the Pontificate of Pius X and will unhesitatingly stigmatize it as the ignoble work of his counsellors. In forming, however, an historical judgment of the Roman Church, one must consider that the Holy See is not the whole of Catholicism. There is in this last, as in all Christian denominations, the human and the divine.

We read in the pages of the history of the Roman Church of great mystics and of equally great sinners. There are in the ranks of Catholicism, teachers of incomparable holiness, and also moral vampires. The ills wrought in and by the hierarchy cannot destroy the good which great souls, devoted to the true meaning of Catholicism, have achieved by the power of and by virtue of the Holy Spirit and not in the name and by the virtue in the Roman Church as well as in all Christian churches, lives in it as in the millions of great souls who, freed from their spiritual thralldom, and the antithesis of the creeds are morally united in their noble efforts to establish the Kingdom of God upon earth.

If, however, some one should be seized one day by the wish to paint with somber colors and in a sectarian spirit the Roman Catholic Church as the avowed enemy of culture, the jail of the spirit, the violator of the divine gift of freedom, the aider and abettor of spies and calumniators, and the foe of scientific progress, then will that historian find the richest material for the demonstration of his theses in the Pontificate of Pius X, and above all in the columns of the anti-Modernist newspapers and periodicals that lived and wrought untold evil with the help of its oblations and benedictions.

THE LAYMAN AND HIS CHURCH.

PROFESSOR R. E. GAINES, RICHMOND COLLEGE.

In this day of strenuous business and of unprecedented material development and expansion, taxing the energies and absorbing the attention of men, it is gratifying to know that our laymen have a growing interest in the church. They are interested in it not so much as an institution to be defended and revered, as an agency for the uplift of mankind through the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth. They are concerned, therefore, that it shall be organized and equipped and operated so as to do its great task in the best possible way.

There are several reasons for this awakening of interest. We live in a very practical day when we demand that everything shall have a worthy task and shall get its task done in a worthy way. Men have scant patience with a thing that is always running and getting nowhere, with an enterprise whose achievement falls short of what may reasonably be expected of it. We live at a time, too, when all about us we see striking evidence of what can be accomplished by coöperative effort under scientific organization for efficiency. It was inevitable that we should ask whether our main business is conducted in efficient ways. Again by reason of the increased mobility of population and the shrinkage of the world through better means of transportation and communication every man has become neighbor to every other man. This more intimate acquaintance with all the peoples of the earth has brought to us a new sense of brotherhood and has stirred in the hearts of Christian people a stronger desire to share with all men everywhere the life that we have in Christ. Moreover, these very changes drawing people together with such rapidity, have produced a world situation which presents to Christianity not only unparalleled

opportunities but grave perils. Along with this has come a quickened social consciousness and a better understanding, perhaps, of the social teachings of Jesus, revealing to us the fact that the church cannot withhold itself from social ministry without having a narrower view of the Kingdom than our Lord evidently had. We have a growing interest in the church, therefore, as the agency for carrying out the program of Jesus, because of our growing appreciation of the program itself.

The layman is studying his church. His discoveries are sometimes a little disconcerting to him. There is criticism of the church both from without and from within, and at times it may seem to him that the critics are making out a real case against his church. This layman needs the help of his pastor. There are several considerations, which, if presented to him fairly, might reassure him no little. The growing criticism of the church is no sign that it is retrograding, but is due to our rising ideal of what we ought to do through it. It seems less efficient to us now than a quarter of a century ago, because we are observing it with a deeper interest. It isn't the foot that's asleep that hurts, but the one that is waking up. But more than this is true. We not only see the task more clearly, but the task itself has enlarged, as our modern complex life is confronting the church with larger and more difficult problems, creating the necessity for readjusting our methods of religious work to suit these changing conditions. If we shrink from the suggestion that there is need to readjust the church from time to time to keep pace with the progress of human society, it is because we are failing to distinguish between the principles of the Kingdom which are abiding, and the organization of the Kingdom whose function is to apply these principles to human life, and which of course must continually be adjusted to human conditions. These conditions are changing largely through the influence of Christianity itself.

But while much of the criticism of the church has been unfair and misleading, there is nothing to be gained by closing our eyes to the fact that we have often defined and circumscribed the church too narrowly and have fallen far short of making it as potent a force for saving and enriching human life as it might have been. For example, many a church has kept its eyes so exclusively on the other world as to stumble right badly in this one. It is often unaware of conditions right in its own community. Our evangelistic preaching has sometimes put the whole emphasis upon getting people into heaven, and has, for the most part, ignored all thought of growth and service—of those processes which conduce to the growth of such character as will make us fit for heaven when we get there. Why is it that the most worthless Christians are the very ones who so rejoice in these sermons on heavenly recognition? Then our exaggerated individualism has obscured the social significance of Christianity, and this has interfered seriously with all coöperative effort.

It would seem that many persons conceive the spiritual life to be passive. We are perhaps not aware how much our thinking is colored by this. For example, we join the church, which is for coöperative effort, with no idea of coöperating. Even when we say that our pastor has the coöperation of the entire church we may mean only that no one is actively obstructing his plans,—as if people could coöperate without operating a little. We pray for a close walk with God with no idea of going anywhere. We speak of following Jesus, not dreaming where that would lead us, or how it would revolutionize the lives of many of us. Think of a perfectly passive Christian devoutly praying all his life for help. Or consider what we mean by “a consistent member of the church.” This phrase is used almost universally to describe not what a man has done but what he hasn’t done. Thus being consistent is a mere matter of refraining. The laziest man alive can refrain, and a dead man could refrain even more consistently.

It is sometimes charged that the church is selfish. This would be a harsh thing to say because selfishness is fatal to the whole program. But there are good people who seem to think more of their church than they think of the people. Churches are sometimes located not with reference to where they can reach the largest number of people, but where they can get the best support. There are churches that have run away from the incoming tide of foreigners moving up to the residential streets for the well-to-do; these churches continue to take collections for foreign missions. It is much pleasanter for some people to do their missionary work by proxy. So there is a tendency to give our religious work too strong a financial bias, and to make our love impersonal. It is easier to love a whole class of people than to love one of them at short range. Sometimes we seem to care less for the Negroes in our own country than for those in Africa, and still less for the one in our own kitchen. Many a man can carry out the great commission so long as he is allowed to interpret "the world" as including all this planet except the territory right around him. Do we not weaken the great commission by adding the phrase "If you can't go, send somebody else"? Our brethren on the foreign field have gone in response to this command,—have gone in their own places and not in ours. Of course we must help them go. But after we have done our utmost in helping them go, this command of our Lord confronts each of us with the intensely personal question "What are you going to do about it?" The great commission is the Christian's job no matter where he goes. The biggest challenge to pastoral leadership today is to dislodge these widespread and deep-seated misconceptions of the Christian program.

We hear much these days about church efficiency. Sometimes a pastor grows enthusiastic over it as a solution for all his perplexing problems and elaborately organizes his church, with the result that this is about all

that happens. Organization as a mere attachment to a passive church simply multiplies the number of wheels that the pastor must turn. The pastor of such a church would be quite justified in saying to his people that organization is for the church and not for the pastor,—that a one-man enterprise needs very little organization. Whenever the church itself gets ready to move forward and do something, organization counts largely for success and pastoral leadership begins to have significance. It must be kept in mind of course that organization like machinery will transmit and apply power but will not create it. The church which exalts machinery to the point of giving to it the whole attention will soon find itself cut off from the power-house. In a church where there is real spiritual power there isn't great danger of having too much machinery. The prime requisite of efficiency after all is to see that the church is linked up with the source of its life and power. In almost every case where there has been a tendency to criticise organization the cause of failure has been either that the church undertook to make organization a substitute for power, leaving no room for God to work through it; or they got the idea that organization is an *agency* for doing things (while you sleep) rather than a *plan* whereby you may do things, if you want to; or it was a passive church that had put the entire burden on their pastor and then, becoming sorry for him, had piled a lot of machinery on him in addition.

We do well to remember also that organization is not an end but a means; it is to facilitate coöperative effort in accomplishing the great task of the church. I have serious doubts about fixing up things for people to do just because we feel they need some religious activity. Sometimes the so-called religious work we give our young people to do is simply a performance, and down in their hearts they do not think it worth while. Think of a church devising artificial tasks when it is in a community full of needs! It is the picture of a husky farmer boy off up-

stairs in his room swinging dumb-bells when the crops all over the plantation are ruining for want of attention. Many of us need to enlarge our conception and revise our definition of religious work.

If the church is ever to go forward in a concerted and aggressive movement for the upbuilding of Christ's Kingdom, there must be far more serious and systematic attention given to education. A man will give something of his means to an enterprise on the recommendation of his friends; but he will not put his life into it without definite concrete knowledge. Our leaders who are themselves for the most part well informed take for granted entirely too much knowledge on the part of the great body of Christians. For example, the church is a coöperative enterprise, and they suppose this is too obvious to need any emphasis. But evidently there are good people who do not think of it as such. You see we grew up with the idea that the church is a sort of bookkeeping arrangement for recording the names of candidates for heaven. That matter having been attended to we have gone on about our business. We employ a church clerk to do the recording and we employ a minister as an enlistment officer, and sometimes hire an evangelist to help him if he complains that he ought not to do it all by himself. Our laymen need to be shaken up and made to see that to be a passive member defeats the very objects of one's joining the church. There are good people who actually persuade themselves that they can remain members or "the dear old church" after they have moved away from it. What must church membership mean to such a man? It is a superstition, pure and simple,—a rabbit-foot to keep the booger from catching him till he is safe in heaven.

We often deplore the general indifference of Christians and the difficulty of inspiring and leading large numbers of them into aggressive service. How largely this is due to ignorance we may not realize. We need to have definite knowledge of an enterprise if it is ever to

enlist our wholehearted support. But there is need in addition to this to have our interest constantly fed with new information of a concrete sort to furnish fresh enthusiasm for each new task. For example, there are a few persons who are intensely interested in our foreign mission work; but they are always persons who know the fields, and know the missionaries, and are keeping informed about all the important movements. There are a few persons who are interested in the work of social uplift; but invariably they are the ones who are studying community problems and who have definite knowledge of community needs.

Many a local church is making substantial progress in religious education. The Sunday School which stands at the center of this activity is making a curriculum and setting high standards, and is making headway towards achieving these ideals. It is a distinct gain that we are thinking of it not as an adjunct but as an activity of the church. An important corollary of this proposition is that the pastor has large responsibility not only for the content but for the methods of teaching. He is generally the most competent and sometimes the only qualified person to determine the general educational policy of the church. The very fact that the pastor has larger fitness for the work often leads him into the mistake of doing much of the work himself instead of inspiring and guiding his laymen to do it. He sometimes yields to entreaties to teach a Sunday School class, generally with the result of lowering his vitality for the eleven o'clock message. It would perhaps be better for him to meet the officers and teachers at some other time for coördinating their work and giving them a broader outlook upon their task. He could take up lessons in advance and give detailed suggestions as to their bearing on problems of aggressive Christian service, as to ways for guiding the activities of the several classes so as to secure appropriate expression as well as impression, and he could show in concrete

ways how to infuse the missionary spirit in the whole teaching process and thus emphasize the missionary character of the whole Christian program. The pastor has a much larger responsibility for the teaching activity of the church than is commonly supposed, and there is no way in which he may touch it more vitally or guide it more effectively than by some such plan of doing systematic work with his teaching force. In this way he will not only be getting the task done on a much larger scale than by trying to do so much of it himself, but he will be rendering important service in developing lay-leadership, a task which is so sorely needed.

The Sunday School is just now presenting problems of the first magnitude in the organized adult department which has grown up so suddenly and which is trying to find itself. It has large possibilities for developing our laymen and relating them more vitally to the church, but in some instances it seems to have been allowed to have almost the opposite effect. In some places these classes have been increased in a few months from a score to several hundred men. They cease to be groups for Bible study and become congregations for inspirational religious exercises conducted on lines so similar to the preaching service as practically to duplicate it. As one meeting follows the other immediately, and as the two together cover rather too long a time to be devoted to one form of activity, the result is that the second service loses the majority of the men who attend the first. Gradually, without anybody intending it or even anticipating it, they will be thought of more and more as two distinct groups; and then come the little rivalries and then the clashing of interests and the movement becomes a disorganizing force in the church. Sometimes its whole name—Organized Adult Department—becomes singularly inappropriate. Its organization has reference only to increasing its size, swelling the list of passive adherents, thus increasing rather than meeting the need for organization; in the

second place the Mellin's food diet which they have, and the fact that they wish merely to be fed and not to be led, is not very suggestive of adults; and sometimes there is little propriety in calling it a department of anything, as it is a law unto itself. The pastors who are laying hold of this great movement and turning it towards aggressive work for the Kingdom, are helping to solve the problem of how to give the layman a vital relation to his church.

Study and service are so inter-related that they should be made to react upon one another in all our church activities. It would seem wise to put the emphasis on study during childhood and youth, meantime not ignoring service specially such as will enhance the study and form habits for the future. But for adults to go on through life doing nothing but studying—learning how to do that which they never intend to do—raises a serious question about the purpose of it all. While study should continue clear through the adult life, the larger portion of our thought and energy should be given to active religious work. That is for the child it is study accompanied by service, and for the adult it is service accompanied by study. Our conception of what the Sunday School should mean to the child is pretty clear, but we have but vague notions of what it should mean for adults. Just at this time when multitudes of adults are being attracted to it the Sunday School should be utilized more largely as a training camp for service in the church and in the social order. To realize such an ideal we shall inevitably broaden and enrich our studies in the adult department. This of course does not mean restricting Bible study, but extending it. It will ever remain the great source of materials for our study. There are many who need to interpret it more broadly if it is to be brought into full harmony with the program and ideal of Jesus and made both a dynamic and a guide in the individual life and in the corporate life of man. Provision should be made for

studying modern missionary movements in the light of present world conditions as well as in the light of the missionary message of the Bible. Along with this there might be study groups in church history, in problems of church efficiency, in the social and political obligations of Christian citizenship and methods for making the spirit of Christianity effective in these relationships, in the great industrial problems which are daily growing in seriousness and which are clamoring for solution—in fact in all those relationships of life which have power to retard or accelerate the coming of the Kingdom.

The Bible has a theological import which has supreme significance for us; but it comes to us freighted with a sociological message also. It tells us of God and of his activities; it tells us much about man also, and of how he ought to behave. We are much more inclined to study the former. It reveals to us our relations to God and our relations to our fellow men. These two hemispheres of human obligation Jesus bound together in the two-fold law of love—love to God and love to one's neighbor. The second of these we have all along held too lightly, forgetting that it was given to us by the Master Himself, and that He gave it the dignity of being like unto the first and great commandment. If groups of our laymen could be induced to study sociology and meet once a week on some evening to discuss its problems in relation to the Christian program it would broaden their outlook upon human life and quicken their interest in human society, and lead them to a clearer appreciation of the social program of the gospel.

In addition to these more or less formal educational activities there are various ways of keeping up the interest of the congregation by providing a constant inflow of information about the work of the Kingdom. A committee may make a study of books and other literature so as to be able to guide the reading of the congregation, the pastor from time to time giving his hearers choice bits of the best books so as to call attention to them; congre-

gational meetings could be held at intervals for studying problems to which the reading had been beforehand directed; occasionally the Wednesday or Sunday evening meeting may be devoted to the study of some informing stimulating book. In these and other ways the mind and heart need constantly to be fed with new knowledge presented vividly and concretely to supply fresh enthusiasm for our constantly growing task.

There is growing need for the layman to pay more attention to the business side of the church. Our proneness to think of religion as detached from the ordinary affairs of men has resulted in our underrating the importance of the business operations of the church, and in our allowing them to go at loose ends. Many a church has been saved from disaster only because the minister has taken upon himself the whole burden. But see at what cost the business interests of the church have been saved! We have swapped off a prophet for a business manager,—an unspeakable calamity, not only to the church, but to the entire community. But it is worth while even for the prophet to take a little time to teach the layman that the church is an organization here in this world; that it is a force which must drive down to the very heart of human life and dominate the whole sweep of human interests; that it must adapt itself to human conditions; that it finds itself in an increasingly complex civilization, a highly institutionalized social order, and must understand and utilize all these social forces which with increasing potency are giving direction to human development.

We need more business methods and business sense in the supreme business of human uplift. The church is preëminently a coöperative enterprise and hence furnishes all the conditions for the application of the principles of scientific organization for efficiency. But this requires business judgment and business experience. Most churches have in their membership men of large financial inter-

ests and long business experience who are accustomed to think through their problems and reach right conclusions,—men whose business judgment is worth thousands of dollars a year. Few of these give any real thought to the conduct of the business of the church. What an asset a man like this is to the Kingdom when he is willing to devote to the church some of the same kind of fine discriminating ability which he gives to the commercial world,—when he is willing to give himself as well as his check-book.

In view of our growing wealth and of the great opportunities for coöperative religious effort our laymen ought to give far more largely of their means to the great missionary and educational enterprises of the church. If the men could be more vitally enlisted in the cause themselves there is no doubt that along with themselves they would give far more largely of their means. Money is a growing power in all human affairs and for this very reason is increasingly important in the missionary and philanthropic work of the church. Moreover, many a man puts so nearly all his energy into making money that it in large measure represents him. A Christian has no right to put his life into his business and convert it into money unless he is going to find some way to reconvert it into spiritual values. The money which he makes, therefore, ought to be to him a sacred thing, and he ought to feel the same responsibility for it as for the rest of his life. The doctrine of stewardship covers not a mere portion of the income, but the whole of it. It refers to the man himself, first and foremost, and then to his money because it is a part of him. The church too often makes it refer to the money instead of to the man. Many men are just now seriously facing this question of stewardship and are undertaking to interpret it in the full light of the spirit and teaching of Jesus, and with reference to present day needs and opportunities. They are asking how much they should give to the cause of

Christ. The only adequate answer to this question is that the entire income must be administered with reference to our relation to the Kingdom. It is one's duty to set aside religiously an adequate portion of the income to be devoted to the work of the church; but is one under any less obligation to be a Christian in the way he spends the rest of the income?

Some good men are not doing clear-cut thinking in this matter. Is it possible that the church may be partly to blame for this? Just at this time when we are complaining that the world puts property above personality, are we not much more concerned about the small portion of a man's income which he gives to the church than we are about the use he makes of the great bulk of it? Are we thinking about his money or about him? Our giving a small portion of the income to distinctly religious work is often made to cover a multitude of sins that we commit in the way we administer the major portion of it. Is Jesus a collector of taxes or the Lord of life? There are those who are more interested in the wages of their children than in the children themselves, but can we think of God as such a Father? The man who recognizes God's claim upon his *life* will *with proper teaching* come to understand and accept all the corollaries to this proposition.

It is gratifying that so many of our men are giving serious attention to the better organization of the church. But we must not devote all our time to this and postpone the task till the next generation. It may be easier to spend the whole day in the shade oiling the reaper, but this gets no grain harvested. Moreover the only way to make a church efficient is to set it at its task. No church will ever become in the next generation what it ought to become unless it is in this generation striving to be all that under the circumstances it can be. The children of this world, unlike some of the children of light, are too wise to become so absorbed in tinkering the machinery as to forget that there is a day's work to be done. Let us

beware lest we make church efficiency an end in itself. It is an important principle of life that we grow by doing. Methods mean much for the efficiency of a church, but far above methods is a deep desire to do the will of God in the life of the world. If our laymen possess the spirit of Christ, and catch some vision of His program, and if they have in their hearts something of the Master's love for humanity they can do much even with poor organization. For it is surprising how when all else has failed love will somehow find a way.

There are multitudes of laymen who are thoroughly dissatisfied with being passive useless Christians. They want their lives to be turned to some account in the salvation of men and in the uplift of their communities. They need leadership. Of course there are some churches that have gone to sleep and have left explicit instructions that they are under no circumstances to be disturbed in their peaceful slumbers. But there are churches all over our country which have great latent resources both of men and means, and which could be led into a program of Christian service that would revolutionize the communities in which they are located, if the pastors only thought it worth while, and could get a vision of a task big enough to be worth the concerted effort of a whole group of people.

We hear a good deal about the problems of the pastorate. If you can ever get a church launched in the task for which it was put here in the world, nine-tenths of all these problems will automatically disappear. It would be a complete answer to all those criticisms we have alluded to. A church at work needs no defense at the hands of anybody. It is a cure for all our spiritual aches and pains. It effectually disposes of all our schisms. Even the deacons must have something to do, and if there is nothing better at hand they will wrangle over the rusty machinery of the church, and very soon they will divide into opposing camps and war is declared. But if the pas-

tor can unite them in unselfish service to humanity, all their petty jealousies will soon be forgotten. It effectually disposes of church discipline. It isn't the colt that is hitched to a wagon pulling a load that gets into trouble, but the one that is tied up in the fence-corner with nothing to do. The colt that will tamely submit to standing still with nothing to do hasn't spirit enough to make a horse that will be worth while any way. How often the very finest spirits among our young people are lost to the church whose policy towards them is one of prohibition and repression and stagnation and idleness. The church at work solves the problem of leadership. Any church may have leaders if it will take the trouble to grow a crop of its own for the capacity for leadership, like every other capacity, grows through its exercise. We are too much inclined to say to our young people that if they will fit themselves we will let them do, while nature is telling them that they must do or they will never be fit for anything.

There is much work that needs to be done within the church. Some of this the pastor does which he ought not to do, and much of it goes undone. If laymen would relieve the pastor of routine work as far as possible, he would have time to prepare sermons worth while,—messages which would inform and stimulate the mind and stir the conscience and speak to the inner life of men and women and lift them into the very presence of God. And it would allow him time to study the problems of properly relating his church to the community outside the four walls of its house of worship, and to the world at large.

The relation of the layman to his church is becoming clearer as we understand better the relation of the church to the community. It requires judgment and breadth of view to keep a proper balance between conserving the strength of the church on the one hand, and in leading it out into unselfish service on the other. Many a church has no interest in a movement for the uplift of the com-

munity unless it is designed exclusively for bringing people into that particular church. It is important for you to take care of your church; but constantly to stimulate its selfishness does not conserve its strength. Many pastors discourage their laymen from making sacrifices for the common good in the hope of getting more of their time for work in and for the church. But a church must have the spirit of service and inspire and guide its members into unselfish tasks, or the routine work of keeping up the organization has no adequate justification. The men who have been led to render unselfish service to humanity in order to establish the Kingdom of God in the hearts and lives of people are the very ones who recognize the supreme worth of the church and who are willing to do whatever is necessary to maintain it. The church which is unselfishly ministering to the whole life of the community with spiritual ends in view, will have no lack of people to keep the central office in working order.

In every neighborhood there are scores of children whose little lives hold unlimited possibilities but who are going to waste and ruin because no one knows they are there. Meantime there are in the church young men and women whose spiritual lives would be transformed if they were set at the task of gathering these children into little groups and teaching them on Sundays and being friends to them during the week. And they can do the former whenever they are willing to do the latter. There are boys, ten to fourteen years of age, who would become a power in the Kingdom if they were taken in hand and organized and directed by some man who has the wisdom of adulthood and the spirit of youth, and who knows how, or thinks it worth while to learn how to deal with boys. In the church right in the same community with these boys there are young men who are actually shriveling up spiritually for want of just such a task as this. These activities are mentioned merely as illustrations of the multitude of things in the church and all round the church

which would afford a man's job for anybody who is willing to undertake them, and which, moreover, would yield big returns for the effort put into them. Of course they involve hard work and a good deal of it. But isn't this just what we are looking for? Our leaders often say that it is difficult to find religious work for all the people to do, but when a real job is suggested they object that it is too much like work. The trouble is our notion of religious work is entirely too contracted and artificial. If the church will widen its conception of Christian work to conform to the spirit and teaching of Jesus, it will find itself in a world packed full of opportunities for following the footsteps of the Master in going about doing good,—doing that highest good of establishing the Kingdom of God here in the Earth.

THE LAMP OF JEHOVAH, THE SPIRIT OF MAN.

E. C. DARGAN, D.D., MACON, GA.

We have this striking thought in Proverbs 20:27. The Revised Version gives a better translation than the King James, viz.: "The spirit of man is the lamp of Jehovah, searching all his innermost parts." More literally still, we might render thus: "Lamp of Jehovah, breath of man; searching all the recesses of his body." The Septuagint gives a literal translation, and the words themselves present no difficulty. It is the thought which is profound and suggestive. The general idea is conveyed in the old Version, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord," but the word candle is misleading and inaccurate. There is a noble sermon by Phillips Brooks, based on the idea of the candle. The great preacher understood it to represent the lighting of a candle, and so to convey the idea of the claim of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of man; kindling the human spiritual by the divine spiritual. In part this thought is involved in the language, but it is not the main idea. The figure is quite different. In the mind or imagination of the thinker, one comes to a house with a lighted lamp, to come in and explore all the rooms, and even hidden chambers of the building. More specifically, the visitor who comes thus to inspect the house is Jehovah. The lighted lamp which He brings in His hand is the spirit of man himself. Here the word rendered spirit is one of several Hebrew terms employed to describe the soul or vital principle of man. The first meaning of the word is breath. It is the word used in Genesis 2:7, where it is said that God breathed into man the breath of life. We cannot always sharply discriminate the lower from the higher meaning of this term, and of other similar ones, both in the Old and in the New Testament. The breath is the vital principle, and then the vital principle is the spiritual nature, involving

both thought and feeling. Many passages will occur to the reader where this shading of meaning from the lower to the higher goes on. Perhaps the best known and most significant of these passages is that in which our Lord says, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own life," where our English Version gives "soul," changing the word in order to indicate the upward passing from the lower to the higher meaning. The breathing, living, sentient principle in man is what is meant. To translate it into our modern language we would say it is the intellectual and moral and spiritual nature of man. Recurring now to the figure, the idea of the writer was that God uses man's own spiritual nature as a means of investigating all the secrets of man's organism. The word here used is sometimes employed for the abdomen, but involves generally the bodily organism. Quite suggestive is the other word that is used, viz.: innermost parts. It is a word which requires these two English words to convey its proper idea. The Septuagint renders it "closets." It means inner rooms. It is thus apparent that the thought is that of thoroughness of investigation. Fully expressed, the picture would be of a man with a lighted lamp in his hand, exploring every chamber of a house.

The spiritual meaning of the striking figure is profound and suggestive. The fact that God does look into the workings, even the secret workings of the human soul, is plainly indicated. This is no strange thought to the Hebrew writers. It finds noble expression in the 139th Psalm. Especially in the closing verses, where the thought finds expression in a prayer so candid as to be even terrifying:

"Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

Likewise, in the closing verses of the 19th Psalm, we have the consciousness of errors, of unconscious faults, of out-

breaking sins, of great transgression, and then the beautiful prayer:

“Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Jehovah, my rock, and my redeemer.”

Thus we see that the search of God into the recesses of the human soul is not a mere investigation, but is a search with a spiritual and moral purpose. God comes into the human spirit in order to find and mend what is wrong in it. The visitor comes to the house to search all its hidden rooms in order to cleanse and beautify them. Every unwholesome and forbidding thing must be sought out and removed. Every good thing found, whether useful or decorative, is to be touched and cleansed and put to its best and highest uses.

Interest centers, however, upon the means employed. The lamp of discovery is the spiritual nature of man himself. The slight incongruity of the figure, viz.: that the spiritual nature of man is at once the lamp and the house, gives way to the striking and beautiful lesson. The intelligence, the sentiments, the yearnings, the imaginations, the holier instincts, the higher purposes, the patient struggles of man in the pursuit of right knowledge and right living are themselves utilized of God in helping man to reach his very best. It is thus that the wonderful mystery and glory of divine and human co-operation in the betterment and final perfection of human character is indicated.

It is surely an encouraging and comforting thought that God takes hold of the spiritual in us to reveal to ourselves our spiritual lacks, and to make us long for their removal. The lamp of our own conscience in the hand of God's Spirit shows us the dark spots in our own characters, and makes us desire to remove them. On the positive side, the light of our own spiritual nature, gleaming like the lamp in the hand of the Spirit, glows with such

radiance as to encourage our aspirations after the highest and the best. The glorious mystery of God's Spirit, working with our spirits toward our spiritual improvement unto perfection, is the great thought of this passage.

It may be that from our modern point of view, and the larger scope of the Christian experience and teaching, we have read into the passage more than its author could have conceived, and yet the suggestion, at least, is contained in the passage itself. It is surely an interesting and striking thing that in one of these detached Proverbs a spiritual thought so suggestive and profound should have place.

DEMANDS UPON THE MODERN PASTOR.

LIVINGSTON JOHNSON, D.D., ROCKY MOUNT, N. C.

Fifteen years ago I resigned as pastor of the First Baptist Church of Greensboro, to become Corresponding Secretary of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina. At the meeting of the Convention last December, I resigned the Secretaryship, after fifteen years of service, having accepted a call to become pastor of the First Baptist Church of Rocky Mount.

SOME CHANGES.

Since I left the pastorate fifteen years ago, many changes have come about. Hard by every town of any size there is a country club, which is made very attractive. Amusements are provided for all classes from the little tot up to the old man. Some of these places are wide open on Sunday, and multitudes who formerly attended church now go to the country club, especially on Sunday evenings. In this state the penalty for Sabbath violation is a fine of a paltry dollar. That small fine can be made back many times on a single Sunday evening.

The automobile has come into general use during the last fifteen years. Just before I left Greensboro an automobile passed through town and everybody, big and little, black and white, ran out to see it. The general consensus of opinion was that it could never be made a practical machine, as it would always be unreliable. Now buggies are almost as rare as automobiles were then. These machines can be made profitable, and are being used by many to great advantage. Some of the members of my church are using their automobiles for the glory of God. On Sunday afternoons bands of workers are carried out to mission Sunday schools in automobiles, and others use them for visiting the sick, bringing the feeble to church, and giving the "shut-ins" occasional outings. But I think

my fellow-pastors will agree that such use of the automobile is the exception and not the rule. Instead of bringing people to church they carry them away. On a pleasant summer Sunday evening, more people pass our church doors in automobiles than enter for worship.

The moving picture show is a recent innovation. The lights are alluring, the music inviting, and men spend time and money attending these entertainments, that could be more profitably spent even if there were nothing demoralizing about the pictures. It is a bad thing to get the moving-picture habit. I know a deacon who says he does not have time to read his denominational paper and who, for that reason, will not subscribe for it, but who finds time to attend the moving-picture show every evening in the week.

Because of these numerous attractions it is very difficult to reach the unsaved. Every pastor knows that it is next to impossible to get the unconverted to attend church during the week. Indeed it has come to pass that distressingly few of any kind, converted or unconverted, attend week-night services. If you go to any of the numerous places of amusement you will find them, but they are not at church.

This is not the only difficulty: the craze for amusement is turning the minds of our young people, especially, away from the more serious things, and is giving them wrong views of life. Because of this passion for pleasure it is becoming increasingly difficult to hold our members to the work and worship of the church. It is pathetic to look in upon the mid-week prayer-meeting of the average church. The poor pastor racks his brain to devise some method of conducting his prayer-meeting by which it can be made sufficiently attractive to draw the people, but a glance at the little handful is all that is necessary to show how he has failed.

The Sunday service must conform to modern demands. The pastor is expected to crowd his message into a half

hour, or, better still, twenty minutes. A half hour grudgingly given once a week or, at most, twice a week, to a message from God about the things of the soul, and from an hour to two hours cheerfully given every afternoon in the week to witnessing a base-ball game, or, in the evening, to seeing a moving picture show!

DEMANDS MORE COMPLEX BECAUSE OF THESE CHANGES.

These are just a few of the difficulties brought about by changed conditions, and yet, despite these difficulties the demands upon the pastor are greater than ever.

He is expected to take an active part in all civic movements. He must have a sufficient knowledge of the law of sanitation and the prevention and cure of diseases to make him a fairly good physician. He must know enough about the evils of society and the remedies needed, the relations between labor and capital, employer and employee, the wrongs that exist and how to right them, to qualify him for a teacher of sociology. His opinions as to legislation needed to bring about social reforms, must be so clear-cut and well-formed that he could occupy a seat in the state or national legislature.

There are some who expect the pastor to use his pulpit himself, or to lend it to some one else, to promote almost any fad. We have our numerous days to be observed, upon which we are requested to preach special sermons on subjects, some of which, by no stretch of the imagination, could be connected with the gospel of Christ. Some of these exploiters criticise the churches for being failures, but want to use the pastors and their pulpits to advertise their wares.

Some demand that the pastor spend most of his time visiting. It is not enough that he visit the sick, or those who are in trouble of any kind; he must ring the door bells of all the homes in his congregation, every few months at least, else he will be charged with not having the "shepherd heart." He must make his preaching so

attractive that he will draw crowds despite the several places of amusement with which he has to compete. He must read the latest books, keep up with current events, and thus put freshness into his sermons. He must attend some meetings of his church almost every night in the week.

What is to be the pastor's attitude toward those amusements which are generally considered innocent? As an illustration let us take base-ball: Those who love the game say that the pastor should attend frequently, as it encourages a clean sport, and gives the preacher an influence with the sport-loving class. There are others who hold that while the game itself is clean, it is made the occasion of gambling, and the preacher, by attending, may encourage others to go who might be led to gamble. If he eats meat he will offend the weak brother, if he eats not he will offend the base-ball fan who, perhaps, needs his ministration more than the other.

HOW IS A PASTOR TO MEET ALL THESE DEMANDS?

Well, he simply cannot do it, and must follow his best judgment as to what he ought to do, or what he can best afford to leave undone. Here, as in many other things, his good common sense, something which every pastor very much needs, will stand him in good stead.

So far as possible he should multiply himself by working through others. He is to be the commander-in-chief, and have general supervision of everything for which the church stands, but he cannot afford to do things which some member of his church can do as well as he. I say he cannot afford it because his time is needed for doing things which his members cannot do. While he should keep in close touch with every department of his church work, he should project himself, through efficient committees, into the whole field of activity. This is better for the church and saves the pastor much valuable time.

Some time ago I took the map of our city and divided the territory which naturally belongs to my church (there are three other Baptist churches in the city), into seven districts. I appointed an active business man as chairman of a committee in each district, and gave him as many assistants as he needed to do the work. We hold these committees responsible for everything in their respective districts that relates, in any way, to our church. The first thing they were expected to do was to take a religious census of the district, and tabulate their findings. Each committee is to work its district. They are to visit the sick, look after the new-comers, get the names of those who should belong to the cradle roll and home departments in the Sunday School, and turn the names in to the Sunday School superintendent. The chairman of each committee was asked to select two or more wide-awake business men to make a canvass of his district for the purpose of securing pledges to meet the financial obligations of his church. When these pledges shall have been secured (we are not through with the canvass yet), we shall expect the chairman, through the financial committee of his district, to look after the collection of pledges when members fail to contribute through the envelope. One Wednesday evening of each month we hear reports from these committees. So far these are the most interesting and enthusiastic meetings of the church, and I shall be greatly disappointed if they do not prove to be very helpful to every department of our work.

The pastor must do a reasonable amount of visiting. He must not neglect the sick or those who are in trouble. They need his help and sympathy, and he needs the blessing that will come into his life by visiting them. It will keep his heart in a sympathetic attitude toward those who suffer and sorrow, to come in daily touch with human need. The pastor's visits should not be limited, however, to those who specially need him. He should visit all the members of his flock sufficiently often for them to feel

that he is their shepherd. He should visit those who are not Christians, in their homes and in their places of business and endeavor, in a tactful way, to win them to Christ.

The pastor should now, as ever, make preaching the gospel his major work. It is to do this that he has been called of God, if he has been called at all.

He should preach *the gospel*. Instead of devoting a whole sermon to the discussion of the European war, let him preach about the Prince of Peace. Instead of giving a dissertation upon the relation between labor and capital, let him preach the doctrine of stewardship, and show that we, and all we have, belong to the Lord. This great doctrine, if it were to take deep root in the hearts of all God's people, would settle all these minor questions. Instead of discussing certain social evils, and legislation needed for their cure, let him preach that sin is the tap-root of all social, as well as all other evils, and that the only remedy for sin is the blood of Christ.

The pastor should preach the *whole gospel*. Many of our pastors, I fear, fail to realize the evils that will result, in so many directions, from a failure to indoctrinate their people. Those who are not intelligent as to the doctrines of their church will fall an easy prey to every false teacher that chances to come along. Russellism, Christian Science and schools of that cult, feed upon the jelly-fish variety of members of our several churches; and the reason we have this jelly-fish variety in such large numbers, is because many of our pastors are not indoctrinating their people. It should go without saying that we should "preach the truth in love," with broadest charity and most fraternal feeling toward Christians of other denominations, the truth preached in that way need never give offense.

The pastor needs to keep in well-balanced proportion the time he spends in his study and that which he gives to visiting. The work he does in his study should help him in giving important instruction in the home and,

on the other hand, his visits in the home should add a freshness and flavor to the work he does in his study. In his study he prepares the meat for his sermons, out in the homes of his people he gets the seasoning.

There are some in every congregation upon whom the pastor learns to depend for inspiration. The larger that circle can be made the more inspiration he will get from his audience. The more intimately his people know him, if he be a true and worthy shepherd, the more love they will have for him, the more interest they will feel in him and the more inspiration they will give to him. O, that subtle, indescribable thing we call personal magnetism! That stream of sympathy that flows from eye to eye and from heart to heart, how much it means to a preacher, as he stands to deliver his message, only those who have felt it know.

To come out from his study where he has just been in communion with God; to face a people with whom, in the home, he has enjoyed Christian fellowship in the week; to be inspired by God's Holy Spirit from above, and by the upturned faces in the pews below; it is this that gives the preacher heart power, power with God and power with men, and it is this that causes his message to take hold on the hearts of men as the message of an angel could not do.

THE WAR SPIRIT—A STUDY IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY.

EDWARD B. POLLARD, D.D., CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The Social Mind is one of the most engaging subjects of modern study. The consciousness and the mental processes of the mass are in many important respects quite unlike the mental processes of the individual and unlike even what might be conceived of as an aggregate of the individual minds which make up the mass. The crowd mind may be compared with a chemical compound, rather than a mechanical mixture. New properties appear in the mass that were not apparent in the component parts.

Among the familiar manifestations of the psychology of the crowd are so-called mental contagions, which at times sweep over communities, like prairie fires, carrying all before them. If such phenomena be limited to a certain neighborhood, it may take the form of a boom in real estate, by which the infection may cause men of a town to pay insane prices for swamp lands, more or less remote, that may be quite worthless when the mental epidemic which gave them market value, has run its course. Again, the psychic contagion may take the form of mob violence, a "lynching bee," a riot and other temporary over-riding of the ordinary restraints and forms of law. Religious revivals are another form in which this collective mind manifests itself. A social, psychic atmosphere is produced in which persons behave in a manner quite foreign to their ordinary modes of thinking and of living. The Great Awakening under the preaching of Edwards, the Methodist Revival under the Wesleys, The Kentucky revival of 1800, not to speak of more recent movements, are familiar examples. The Crusades are among the most conspicuous historic cases of the religious epidemic. Peter the Hermit, and other ardent, spectacular souls threw their tremendous energy and their eloquence

into the midst of the masses who for several centuries had been nursing a hatred of the Infidel Saracens. Constant friction with the Moor in Europe had been nursing the Christian wrath to keep it warm. Soon, all the representatives of the cross were aglow with fiery zeal for the holy adventure. The follies and fanatic extravagances of that era are too well known to be recited here. Only it may be affirmed that a most powerful appeal was made to such elemental human passions as love of adventure, racial antipathy, religious loyalty, love of brethren, hatred of the unbelieving foreigner, pride of the warrior, desire for expiation of sin, and hope of eternal life.

We must be careful, however, to distinguish between public opinion and the crowd mind. Public opinion on a subject, as we conceive of it, is some social judgment which is reached after more or less seasoned public deliberation. It is this that is the hope and very life of a republic. It is this to which Mr. Lincoln referred when he declared, "You can't fool all the people all the time." Give the people time and they will generally come to quite an accurate judgment on public questions; and public opinion is the dynamic which sends and keeps the government to its true course. On the other hand, there is no greater danger to a republic than the impulsive action of the mob mind. Our fathers appreciated this and published something new in government, to safeguard the nation against this peril. They promulgated a written constitution, the existence of which makes our government less readily responsive to the popular will than some of the monarchies of the old world—notably, England; but also much less liable to be swept away by impulsive mass movements, than republics without a written organic law.

There are certain more or less well understood psychic facts that must be considered in discussing the crowd mind. The first is a very general fact of all mental life. Thought continually tends to have itself expressed in action. Men become what they think about. They get what they are mentally preparing themselves for.

There are also certain characteristics of the collective mind, as contrasted with the individual's mental processes. The former is very much more child-like and primitive. The crowd is more suggestible; more emotional, more credulous. All mass movements tend to arrest thought. Crowds are intellectually inferior to individuals. Strong emotion tends to inhibit reason. Only the strongest can withstand the power of the mass. Crowds never shape their action on the basis of reason. Little adapted to reason, they are quick to act. Imitativeness and imagination are conspicuous mental characteristics of a crowd that has been brought under the sway of some instinctive impulse.

The crowd also moves upon a lower moral level than does the individual. Lack of conscience and of moral restraint are notoriously true of the mob. At Clermont, Pope Urban made an harangue to the multitude, urging them to go on the great adventure to the Holy Land, declaring that the infidel Turks were cowards, and promising the faithful crusaders not only success but absolution from their sins. The people cried, "It is the will of God, it is the will of God." They could not wait for the appointed day for departure, but went forth, men, women and children, with uncontrolled passion, massacring and robbing the Jews in all the towns through which they journeyed.

Isolated, an individual may be a perfect gentleman, under the temporary influence of the mass movement, he may suddenly become a barbarian. So men, who in matters of general intelligence and culture, may be quite inferior to their fellows, will become much like them in their instincts and passions.

Le Bon states that among the most savage members of the French Convention, were to be found the most inoffensive citizens. Napoleon found them among his most docile servants.

Crowds do not act consistently. They never try to reconcile past conventions, or established principles, with present conduct.

At times when impulsive social action is imminent, it is pre-eminently true, as Mr. Bigelow puts it:

“A merciful providence fashioned us hollow

In order that we might our principles swallow.”

The crowd has no conscience.

Prof. Leuba, in a recent article on Evangelist Billy Sunday, says:

“There are in human nature, belonging to human nature, forces that, for better or for worse, can be appealed to and stirred to effective intensity; so that cowards may become heroes or heroes cowards, and meek men may turn into bloodthirsty beasts or steadfast followers of Jesus even unto the death of the martyr.”

In the crowd we become better than ourselves or worse than ourselves according to the kind of passion that for the moment sways us.

Davenport in his “Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals,” tells of an incident which happened in a negro church in Tennessee, as an example of crowd morality. A donation party was to be extended the minister. A brother volunteered to make collections from the various members of the congregation, borrowing a yoke of steers and a cart from a colored sister in the neighborhood to facilitate collections. Having made a success of his efforts, the collector went to Chattanooga, sold the provisions, clothing, etc., and then also the cart and oxen, and departed to visit relatives in Atlanta. After a while, having spent all, he returned to the neighborhood, professing deep contrition. He was met with indignation, and cited to appear before the church for trial. The house was crowded, and after charges were brought in due form, the offending brother was given a chance to be heard. Coming forward he took his place upon the platform with the preacher. “I ain’t got nuffin’ to say for myself,” he began in penitent tones, “Coz I is one poor, miserable sinner. But, bruderin, so is we all po’ miserable sinners, and de good book sez we must fergit. And how many

times, bruderin, tell sebben times? No, sebbenty times sebben; and I ain't sin no sebbenty times sebben, and I'se jest gwin' to suggest that we here and now turn dis here into a fergibness meetin' and everybody in dis great company dat is willin' to fergib, come up now, while we sing dat good ole hymn, 'Come, ye sinners, po' and needy' and shake my han.'" In great voice he started the tune, and they began to come, first the more suggestible that hadn't given anything to the donation party, and so had lost nothing; then those who hadn't lost much; and then still others. At length, all had come but one woman who stuck fast to her seat. "Dar's one po' miserable sinner still lef' dat won't fergib. She won't fergib." (She was the old woman who lost the steers.) "Now I suggest we hab a season of prayer, specially remem'bring dis one po' ole sinner, and gib her one mo' chance. After they had prayed and sung the hymn, the old lady came up too."

It will be observed that when the crowd mind is aroused the appeal is always to something primitive, elemental instinctive. Among the most effective of such appeals is the appeal to *fear*—possibly the oldest impulse of the human breast, and certainly one of the most powerful. Herbert Spencer gave to fear a central place in social control—fear of the living, as the very root of political control, and fear of the dead the root of all religious control. Professor William James places fear along with love and anger as "the three most exciting emotions of which human nature is susceptible." Fear will cause a wild stampede in a theater, and the strong will ruthlessly trample the weak under their feet. Fear of hell, under the passionate appeal of a Sunday, will cause multitudes to give up the primrose paths of sin for the sawdust trail of penitence. Great revivals have often broken out in times of war, or of great business depression—a fact which testifies to the place fear has (fear of poverty, of bereavement, of death) in mass movements.

At a time when strong appeals are made to primitive impulses, the qualities of personal leadership are of peculiar importance. The crowd respects only courage, dash, daring. The leader of a crowd is always an egotist. As Le Bon puts it, the leader of a mob must be a despot. Crowds do not reason, they act. Here is the opportunity on the one hand for the demagogue to stampede the multitude into ill-considered action, and, on the other, the strong will of a great, courageous leader, in times of crisis, to guide the panic-stricken sheep back to the calm places of safety. Prof. Ross says: "In a deliberative assembly . . . where there is cool discussion and leisurely reflection, ideas struggle with one another and the fittest are accepted by all. In the fugitive, structureless crowd, however, there can be no fruitful debate. Under a wise leader the crowd may act sagaciously. But there is no guarantee that the master of the crowd shall be wiser than his followers. The man of biggest voice or wildest language, the aggressive person who first leaps upon a table, raises aloft a symbol or utters a catching phrase is likely to become the bell-wether."

There are certain more or less well defined laws which govern the mental movements of masses of people. Professor Giddings states them somewhat as follows: First, the law of *origin*. Impulsive social action begins among people of least inhibitory control. Second, the law of *progress*; the contagion spreads in geometric rather than in arithmetic ratio, and Third, the law of *restraint*. The campaign will be retarded, and finally checked, when it reaches those persons who are least suggestible and accustomed to the greatest self-control, those who are trained to subordinate impulse to rational processes.

The law of contact must also be noted. Proximity of individuals one to another is important in the spread of mental contagions. But, it must be remembered that there is in the modern world a crowd mind which is not dependent upon spatial contiguity of the individuals

which make it up. Easy and quick methods of communication through telegraph, telephone, the railway and the daily press have extended the definition of the word crowd. The mob mind may be made up of men and women never actually assembled in any one place at any one time.

Let us now apply these facts and principles of crowd psychology to the war spirit which two years ago spread itself over the major portion of the civilized world, and threatened before its conclusion to engulf us all.

The rapid spread of this contagion throughout Europe and much of Asia is readily accounted for—assuming that there were autocrats, diplomats, bureaucrats, and plutocrats enough with their clumsy self-seeking to touch off the conflagration. There was inflammable material in abundance and a psychic atmosphere altogether favorable to a rapid spread of the war epidemic. Competitive armament had been in progress for a generation. In one country at least, the doctrine of the divine right of force had been subtly permeating the national thinking. A false practical philosophy, too, which assumed that a merchant ship is futile unless backed by a warship; that competitive commercialism means necessarily competitive navalism, was prevalent. Throughout Europe, for an entire generation, the soldier was everywhere in evidence. A mental militaristic atmosphere was all pervasive. A single assassin's bullet was like an electric spark, sent into the chemical mixture, inducing the rapid horrible red precipitate, that for years had been held in solution. That is, Europe, through its cultivated suspicions and nursed antipathies, even through its alliances of counter *ententes* had produced for itself a psychic atmosphere, which, by the law of suggestion made war inevitable. Thought always tends to have itself translated into action. Europe simply got what she had been thinking and planning. It is a well understood fact in biological science that the more recently acquired characters whether racial or in-

dividual, will be the first to give way in times of extraordinary stress. The earlier will assert themselves over the later. This explains why civilization seems to have collapsed utterly in the present European war as it always gives way before the mob mind. Babylon is old; civilization is comparatively new. Herbert Spencer called attention to the passing of peoples in the evolution of the race from the era of militarism to the era of industrialism. We had calmly supposed that mutual commercial advantage, among modern nations, industrial interdependence, would make wars on a large scale improbable. We found we were wrong, for when the crowd mind is once aroused, action is in accord with instincts altogether primitive. The mob reverts to ancient type. We had thought that twenty centuries of the religion of the Prince of Peace had made war no longer probable. But Christianity is very new, while racial hate, brute force, the spirit of revenge are as old as the race. This fact accounts for the small influence socialism could exert in Germany when once the war was declared. Socialistic theories concerning industrial and international peace are very young; the impulse to fight with and for one's own land is very old. The newly acquired character breaks down before an instinctive trait. Socialism has no long established traditions, no imaginary back-ground. One has pictured a group of socialists in a dreary hall midst tobacco smoke and cheap cigars. An imperial brass-band and a battalion of soldiers pass by. "That excellent gathering of enlightened humanity will follow the brass band to hell, provided it keeps on playing popular airs." These well-meaning men are victims of traditions of countless generations, customs of thought mellowed by age, that have entered into their subconscious being, into the very fibre of their life. It is only when the socialists shall take time to think that they will come to themselves and re-discover their socialism.

It can readily be seen that in the contest between what has come to be called "preparedness" and "pacifism"

the former has a decided advantage over the latter, from the viewpoint of the psychology of the crowd. Militarism appeals to the oldest of human instincts, to self-preservation, to brute force, to bodily fear, to outward glory, to the dramatic, to spectacular glory.

Who can tell what changes might have taken place in our history, had one, say of Mr. Bryan's ability to sway the masses, gone up and down the land using the incident of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, or of Villa's invasion to incite the populace to war, rather than preaching peace?

The mental attitude of fear as related to the war-spirit is significant. Preparation for war usually begins in fear of a possible, or a supposed enemy. The preparation has a double psychic effect. It tends to embolden the side prepared, and to incite fear in others, who in turn begin to make counter preparation. Both these attributes are distinctly conducive to war. Fear is effective in preventing war only when one side is hopelessly in advance of the other in preparation, and when no alliances can be formed to offset the superiority of the rival country's preparation. Wars are usually begun by one side striking because it feared that the other side would strike first; on the principle that the best defensive blow is the offensive blow. Fort Sumter was stormed because the Confederates feared that the re-enforcements on the way, would give trouble; and the re-enforcements were on the way, for fear the Carolinians would storm Sumter. Lucretius says, "Fear makes the Gods." Yes, one God at least, the god Mars.

Even granting that fear may sometimes prevent a war—from its nature, appeal to fear can never be a final appeal. The weaker nation may be made to fear the struggle, but nothing is settled thereby, except this, that temporary suspension of hostilities is prudent.

Moreover, fear dwarfs and distorts the reason. In its presence the critical faculties lie dormant or are par-

alyzed. For example a few months ago some were very sure that thousands, if not millions of German-Americans were ready at any moment to mobilize at some points where they will be supplied with arms from immense secret arsenals, and heavy artillery will be brought out of the cellars and mounted on the concrete foundations that have been built throughout the country and in short order America will be Teutonized. Fear makes the ghosts!

Unfortunately the newspapers whose interests lie in the direction of fostering excitement, are naturally on the side of impulsive action. Military establishments too aggressively cultivate the war spirit. Allied trades and the money lenders can be counted upon to encourage the war spirit. These, acting upon the more suggestible of the people are always the militaristic menace. Their appeal is to the more primitive instincts, while a gospel of forbearance, good will and brotherly love which are among the more recently acquired characters of the people, are the first to break down in times of war-scare.

Women and children are, generally speaking, more suggestible than men with less inhibitory control. They respond more quickly to emotional appeal. Just how general women's preparedness movement has spread throughout the country we are not now able to say. But about the time of the height of the recent agitation for preparedness, the papers informed us that a number of excellent and patriotic women had already stored their closets with bandages, absorbent cotton and even perishable rubber goods; that many cots were already in waiting for our wounded soldier boys who were shortly to be taken from the battlefield to comfortable suburban homes. In the year 1840, when the Millerites thought the world was coming to an end many believers made their ascension robes, and were watchfully waiting for the trumpet to sound. Some even went out on their roofs or climbed tall trees that they might have superior position to meet the Lord in the air. But the contagion soon passed.

One of the most remarkable phenomena connected with the Crusades was the "Children's Crusade," awakened by Stephen, a shepherd boy of Cloyes preaching among the pilgrims of St. Denys. Under the impression of the crowd spirit thousands of little ones, without food, or adequate clothing or protection started out from Europe to go to the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher, only to perish of hardship and cold, or to be sold into slavery. We may well imagine what a wave of juvenile militarism might have swept over this country had the atmosphere been more highly surcharged with the fighting spirit and the Secretary of the Navy had been a little more suggestible and histrionic, when an enthusiastic and highly patriotic little girl of Brooklyn sent in her dime to build a battle ship for Uncle Sam.

There are some forces at work in our national life that have strongly tended to inhibit the emotional contagion of war else we should have long ere this been drawn into the old world maelstrom. It is a fact of crowd psychology that the closer the proximity of the people to one another the more easily does the contagion spread. America is thousands of miles from the center of greatest excitement. But all parts of the world are close to all other parts today, hence the possibility, for the first time in history, of a world-wide war contagion. We must look further for reasons why thus far the fever has been checked here. It is an observed fact in the crowd psychology that the greater the homogeneity of any people the more readily does a mental contagion spread. This accounts for the fact that such mass movements as revivals are more easily brought about in a community of homogeneous population. Men of various nationalities do not think readily and act spontaneously together. The heterogeneous character of America's population is one element in our comparative coolness in the midst of the world's war fever; and is one reason why we shall never be a militaristic nation. A third element is doubt-

less the busy condition of our people, getting rich by filling war orders. A busy man is not easily hypnotized; he is not easily suggestible, nor highly emotional. If hard times had continued, and there had been much idleness, we should probably have been drawn into war. An idle, discontented man will respond to the harangue of the blatant demagogue, or the man who appeals to elemental primitive instincts.

It was this that made Cataline dangerous to the Roman republic in the days of Cicero and Cæsar.

This leads me to suggest another reason why we of the United States have not been swept into the current. The present president, Woodrow Wilson, is a man of unusual self-possession, a man not easily swept off his feet by the surging sentiments about him. This paper does not undertake to approve or attack his policies nor to discuss the moral question, whether or not we should have entered the struggle for the sake of Belgium, or otherwise; or whether or not we should have early sent an army into Mexico to avenge our losses there in persons and property. Ours just now is a psychological interest. Two types of men at the head of government at such a crisis as this through which we have been passing, would probably have brought us into a very different writing of the current history—the acquiescent McKinley type, unable to inhibit the rising tide of the crowd mind, and the Theodore Roosevelt type, easily suggestible, impulsive, quick to act and with an unusual power of appeal to the more primitive instincts of human life.

Again, it may be said in explanation of our composure in the crisis through which we have been passing, that American citizens are individualistic, inured above most people, to do their own thinking. All these things taken together seem to account for the fact that while in Europe the bullet of a peasant precipitated a deluge of blood, in America neither the sinking of the *Lusitania*, nor the unspeakable chaos in Mexico had produced a state of mind in America which demanded war.

These things, rather than a lack of moral discernment, as some militants have declared, have been the forces that have up to this time kept our country out of the maelstrom of the European war.

The war spirit is a debauching of one of the noblest and most enduring instincts of the human breast—the spirit of conquest, the impulse to “subdue and have dominion.” But the social mind needs, above all things else today, to be directed toward social, moral and spiritual conquests. The overthrow of war itself, the war against war, is one of the many immanent opportunities for the proper investment of the fighting spirit.

But peace cannot be had till men learn to think in terms of peace, and proceed to make preparation for peace in the establishment of substitutes for war, both as a means of settling disputes, and as an avenue for the manly, constructive, fighting spirit.

It is not easy to remove the veil, even of the near future, in our own country. The majority of the people greatly prefer to think and act in peace terms rather than in terms of militancy. As long as the European war lasts, however, and disorders continue on the South of us, we can never be sure that the mental prophylactics which have thus far prevented the war disease from spreading to any great degree on this side the water, will continue to be effective. Let us hope that no incident like the sinking of the *Maine*, and no demagogue with power to play skillfully upon the elemental passions of the multitude, may sweep the people from the moorings of their splendid self-control.

SOURCES OF THE FIRST CALVINISTIC BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN, PH.D., D.D., SOUTHERN BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

In the address "To the Judicious and Impartial Reader" prefixed to the great London Baptist Confession, known in America as the Philadelphia Confession, the compilers, after pointing out the fact that the Congregationalists had used the Westminster Confession with necessary modifications to produce their Savoy Articles, state that

"We did in like manner conclude it best to follow their [that is the Congregational] example, in making use of the very same words with them both, in those articles (which are very many) wherein our faith and doctrine is the same with theirs. And this we did, the more abundantly to manifest our consent with both, in all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, as also with many others whose orthodox confessions have been published to the world, on behalf of the Protestants in diverse nations and cities; and also to convince all that we have no itch to clog religion with new words, but to readily acquiesce in that form of sound words which hath been, in consent with holy scriptures, used by others before us; hereby declaring before God, angels, and men, our hearty agreement with them, in that wholesome Protestant doctrine, which, with so clear evidence of scriptures they have asserted. Some things, indeed, are in some places added, some terms omitted, and some few changed; but these alterations are of that nature, as that we need not doubt any charge or suspicion of unsoundness in the faith, from any of our brethren upon the account of them."*

*McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, pp. 224f.

Such is their own statement of the relation of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith to the Savoy Articles of the Congregationalists and the Westminster Confession of the Presbyterians together with the motives that actuated them in thus leaning so heavily upon the work of their Protestant predecessors. The dependence of the Philadelphia Confession upon the Westminster has, therefore, long been known and recognized.

But it has been generally supposed that the first Calvinistic Baptist Confession, that drawn up by representatives of seven churches, in London in 1644, and a revised edition of which was presented to Parliament in 1646, was an independent production. There was no Calvinistic Baptist model to follow, and nothing is said in any of the introductory or concluding matter of any dependence or borrowing. So far as known neither contemporaries nor subsequent historians have pointed out any dependence on earlier confessions, and yet it now transpires that this confession leaned almost as heavily on earlier Congregational confessions as the Philadelphia Confession on the Westminster and the Savoy Articles.

The ascertainable facts seem to be about as follows:

In 1596, the London-Amsterdam (Congregational) church published a confession "to stop the mouths of impious and unreasonable men."* This served as the confession of the Congregational churches until the publication of the Savoy Articles in 1658, and was in general circulation among them until that time. The members of the first seven Calvinistic Baptist churches of London had been Congregationalists, at least most of them, and were naturally more or less familiar with and attached to the Congregational Confession. When it became necessary to state their newly adopted Baptist views it was perfectly natural for them to use the confession with

*Quotations of Congregational Confessions are taken from Walker's "Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism"; those on Baptist Confessions from McGlothlin's "Baptist Confessions of Faith."

which they were familiar as the basis of the new statement so far as that was possible. So little had they changed their convictions about things other than the subject and mode of baptism that they could take the major portion of their new confession almost bodily from the old one with which they were already familiar. The new Baptist Confession had fifty-three articles, of which twenty-nine were taken from the old Congregational Confession. These are articles I—XI, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX, XX, XXXIII—XXXV, XLII—XLVIII, L—LII. Three additional articles were taken from a statement of fourteen "Points of Difference" between the Congregationalists and the Church of England submitted to James I, at his accession to the English throne in 1603. These are XXXVI—XXXVIII. Decidedly more than half of the Baptist Confession, or to be exact, thirty-two out of fifty-three articles, were thus derived from these two existing statements of Congregational faith. More than half of the Congregational Confession, which had forty-five articles, was used. The articles thus incorporated were 1-19, 24-26, 34, 36, 38, 41-44. The articles taken from the "Points of Difference" were 5-7.

None of these articles were verbatim repetitions of those found in the Congregational documents, but most of the changes are purely verbal—changes in the order of words, in spelling and capitalization, the substitution of synonymous terms, etc. Many of these changes are made on no recognizable principle, but often appear as if they were the result of an effort to reproduce the articles from memory. In about twenty instances the articles were taken over almost verbatim, while in the remaining cases there were more or less extensive and important changes made by the omission or addition of phrases, clauses or sentences. In some cases there were both omissions and additions to the same article.

In order to show clearly how closely the Baptist Confession reproduces the Congregational a few articles are

shown below in parallel columns, the Congregational original on the left, the Baptist modification on the right :

CONGREGATIONAL.**Art. 6—1596.**

That this therefore only is lyfe eternall to knowe the only true God, & vvhom hee hath sent into the vvorlde Iesus Christ. And that on the contrarie the Lord vvvill render vengeance in flaming fire vnto them that knowv not God, & vvich obey not the Gospell of our Lord Iesus Christ.

Art. 36—1596.

That thus beeing rightly gathered, established, and still proceeding in Christian communion & obedience of the Gospel of Christ, none is to separate for faults and corruptions which may and so long as the Church consisteth of mortall men, will fall out & arise among them, even in a true constituted Church, but by due order to seeke redresse thereof.

Art. 38—1596.

That though Congregations bee thus distinct and severall bodyes, every one as a compact Citie in it self, yet are they all to walke by one and the same rule, & by all meanes convenient to haue the counsell and help one of another in all needfull affayres of the Church, as members of one body in the common Faith, vnder Christ their head.

BAPTIST.**Art. VI—1644.**

This therefore is life eternall, to know the onely true God, and whom he hath sent Iesus Christ. And on the contrary the Lord will render vengeance in flaming fire to them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Iesus Christ.

Art. XLVI—1644.

Thus being rightly gathered, established, and still proceeding in Christian communion, and obedience of the Gospel of Christ, none ought to separate for faults and corruptions, which may, and as long as the Church consists of men subject to failings, will fall out and arise amongst them, even in true constituted Churches, untill they have in due order sought redresse thereof.

Art. XLVII—1644.

And although the particular Congregations be distinct and severall Bodies, every one a compact and knit Citie in it selfe; yet are they all to walk by one and the same Rule, and by all meanes convenient to have the counsell and help one of another in all needful affaires of the Church, as members of one body in the common faith under Christ their onely Lord.

The above quotations will serve to show how nearly identical many of the articles are. It will also be observed that the Baptists have considerably improved the English of their distinguished Congregational predecessors.

In some cases only parts of articles were taken, the change of circumstances or the difference in beliefs rendering the remainder unsuited to the Baptist Confession. This will be seen in the following:

CONGREGATIONAL.

Article 6—1603.

That the Ministers aforesaid being lawfully called by the Church where they are to administer, ought to continew in their functions according to Gods ordinance, and carefully to feed the flock of Christ committed vnto them, being not inioyned or suffered to beare Civill offices withall, neither burthened with the execution of Civill affaires, as the celebration of marriage, burying the dead, &c., which things belong aswell to those without as within the Church.

BAPTIST.

Art. XXXVII—1644.

That the Ministers aforesaid, lawfully called by the Church, where they are to administer, ought to continue in their calling, according to Gods Ordinance, and carefully to feed the flock of Christ committed to them, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind.

There is observable in the Baptist work a disposition to simplify the Confession by the omission of abstruse theological terms, and theological ideas not well authenticated in Scripture. For example in article 2, on the Trinity the usual statement that there are "three distinct persons coeternall, coequall, & coessential, beeing every one of them one & the same God," etc., is changed into the Scriptural statement that "In this God-head, there is the Father, the Sonne, and the Spirit; being every one of them one and the same God," etc.

The usual Calvinistic statement on decrees was that God had ordained some men *and angels* to eternal life. The Baptists modified this by omitting *angels*, saying nothing about them in connection with God's decrees.

There is a very clear and definite softening of the Calvinism of the Congregational Confession in article 3. On the point of election the article reads as follows:

"And touching his cheefest Creatures that God hath in Christ before the foundation of the world, ac-

according to the good pleasure of his will, ordeyned some men and Angells, to eternall lyfe to bee accomplished through Iesus Christ, to the prayse of the glorie of his grace. And on thother hand hath likevvise before of old according to his iust purpose ordeined other both Angells and men, to eternall condemnation, to bee accomplished through their own corruption to the prayse of his iustice.”

This statement is changed by the Baptists to read as follows:

“And touching his creature man, God had in Christ before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of his will, foreordained some men to eternall life through Iesus Christ, to the praise and glory of his grace, leaving the rest in their sinne to their just condemnation, to the praise of his Justice.”

Only one other change will be noted, and that one seems to indicate a rather striking difference in the theological viewpoint of the respective framers of the two confessions. It has to do with the effect of the atoning death of Christ. In regard to Christ's death it is said in article 14 of the Congregational Confession, “that touching his Priesthood, beeing consecrated, hee hath appeered once to put avway sinne, by offering & sacrificing of himself; and to this end hath fully performed and suffred all those things, by which God through the blood of that his crosse, in an acceptable sacrifice, might bee reconciled to his elect.”

The Baptists make the latter part of this excerpt read as follows: “Suffered all those things by which God, through the blood of that his Crosse in an acceptable sacrifice, might reconcile his elect onely.” That is th Congregationalists make the death of Christ reconcile God to his elect, while the Baptists make that death reconcile the elect to God. Much modern theological discussion is involved in this difference of view.

* * * * *

Of the articles in the Congregational Confession which the Baptists have omitted altogether, Articles 20-23, deal with the ministry and its relation to the church and to Scripture; Articles 27-33 treat of the Church of England and the necessity of leaving it; Articles 35 and 37 treat of baptism and the supper; Articles 39 and 40 treat of the authority and religious duties of the magistrates, declaring that they ought to pull down the Church of England and build up a pure Scriptural Church, and Article 45 declares that they have no objection to the use of the Lord's prayer.

Of the twenty-one articles which the Baptists added Articles XII, XIV, XVI and XVIII treat of Christ and his offices, simply enlarging on these points; Article XXI limits the benefits of Christ's death to the elect, XXII defines faith, XXIII asserts the perseverance of the saints, XXIV declares the sinner is wholly passive in the process of salvation, XXV to XXXII assert the freedom of the gospel offer, progressive sanctification through the Spirit, justification, divine help in the affairs of life, etc. Articles XXXIX to XLI state very clearly and forcefully the Baptist position on the various questions related to baptism.

Articles XLVIII and XLIX are on civil government and are in sharp contrast to the Congregational demand that the government should interfere in religious matters. Robert Browne, the founder of the Congregationalists, had very clearly enunciated the principle of religious freedom, which he had doubtless imbibed from the Anabaptists with whom he had been in contact. Later Congregationalists, however, wavered for some years, always demanding freedom for themselves, but failing to see that this demand involved the granting of freedom to others. In article 39 of the Confession of 1596, they declare it to be the duty of civil magistrates "to suppress and root out by their authoritie all false ministeries, voluntarie Relligions and counterfeyt worship of God, to abolish and

destroy the Idoll Temples And on the other hand to establish & mayntein by their lawes every part of Gods word his pure Relligion and true ministerie” No such doctrine as this is found in this or any other Baptist confession.

This will be sufficient to show that these first English Calvinistic Baptists leaned very heavily on the work of the earlier Congregationalists in the formulation of their first confession. Possibly all of them had come out of Congregational churches, and hence were familiar with their confessions. But they also show marked independence, modifying, omitting, adding to, as was necessary to express their new convictions. In this respect they were true pioneers of all the Baptists since their day; for it has been characteristic of later Baptists to draw up many confessions, but feel bound by none of them. They have adapted, adopted, discarded, built new, confessions as seemed best at the time. In this way they have escaped the blight of theological dry rot, have preserved their intellectual and spiritual freedom, have responded readily to changes in theological atmosphere and have been able to keep their eyes open to the light from whatever source it has come.

THE LONG ROAD TO FREEDOM OF WORSHIP.

W. W. EVERTS, D.D., ROXBURY, MASS.

And most of all thank God for this—
The war and waste of clashing creeds
Now end in words and not in deeds,
And no one suffers loss or bleeds
For thoughts that men call heresies.

—H. W. Longfellow.

PART I.

Prof. Luigi Luzzati of the University of Rome, in a volume on "Liberty of Conscience" announces his purpose to prepare an anthology of authors who have advocated religious liberty. "In it," he says, "will appear the great spirits who in all ages have defended the freedom of the soul. In it will shine resplendently the two volumes of tracts on liberty of conscience that were written by early English Baptists." The English Baptists were anticipated by the Swiss Anabaptists a century earlier in the proclamation of absolute religious liberty. Before the Swiss Anabaptists, for a thousand years, the heralds of liberty had been, like angels' visits, few and far between.

This hiatus of a thousand years is astounding in view of the fact that Christ and the Apostles and the early church Fathers announced explicitly the principle that the conscience is subject to God only. What could be more plain than the words of the Saviour, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's"; or the words of Peter, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye"; or the words of Paul, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal"; or the words of Tertullian, "It is no part of religion to force religion"; or the words of Lactantius, "Religion is defended by dying not by killing, by patience not by cruelty, by faith not by crime. To defend religion by blood-shed is to

pollute it." Even the language of Emperor Constantine, in the Edict of Milan, proclaimed in the year 313, preserves uncorrupted the early Christian tradition. "Christians and all others," he says, "are given the right to follow whatever religion each man may have preferred. Every man's worship is free. We will not diminish the honor of any religion." Then in his proclamation to the peoples of the East he says, "Whatever truth a man has received let him not smite his neighbor with it. Rather let him help him if he can. If not, let him desist." The noble sentiments of Constantine were abandoned by his successors who revived the system of persecuting Roman Emperors, to whom nothing was sacred except their own dignity. It was not until the invasion of the Barbarians, with their free ways, that freedom was acclaimed by another ruler. It was Theodoric, the Goth, who said, "We cannot command religion, because none can compel anyone to believe against his will."

The first martyrdom under Christian rule, was that of Priscillian. This act of Spanish bishops, in the year 397, was loudly protested by Martin of Tours and Ambrose of Milan, but the protest was not sincere for they objected not to punishment but only to capital punishment. They preferred merely to banish heretics. That was exactly the position taken by Ambrose's disciple, Augustine. At first this great theologian was confident that, with his powers of argumentation, the truth needed no physical help. He laid down the principle that a man can believe only what he will. But when the Donatists invaded the bishopric of Hippo and swept everything before them, they dragged the great theologian, as Döllinger says, "down to a sophist and perverter of Scripture." In his determination to find Scripture warrant for persecution, he perverted the words of the parable, "Compel them to come in," into a formula for intolerance and into a principle of persecution. It was he, as Lecky says, not Dominic, who was the real author of the Spanish Inquisition,

for Augustine fixed not only the creed but also the church discipline of the Middle Ages. It was he who defined heresy as the worst of crimes and heretics as murderers of souls. The most disgraceful words that Saint Augustine ever wrote are found in his "Retractations" in the passage which disavows the noble sentiments found in his earlier writings.

There is no better field in which to investigate the causes of religious persecution than the conduct of this Church Father. Buckle finds the chief cause in lack of intellectual enlightenment, but Augustine was the most enlightened man of his age. John Locke, C. J. Fox, Leslie Stephen, W. H. Lecky, John Fiske, Mandell Creighton, J. B. Bury, Ruffini and other distinguished writers find in orthodoxy the root of this great evil. Some of them mistake proper church discipline for persecution. It is sufficient answer to them all to say that the Apostle Paul was so orthodox and so sure that no gospel but his own was true that he called down anathema upon an angel from Heaven who should come and preach a different gospel, and yet persecution was so far from his thoughts that he indignantly demanded "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." H. C. Lea, the authority on the Spanish Inquisition, accounts for the evil by mistaken zeal. What was Augustine zealous for? Not for truth or purity, because those were the very aims of the Donatists. He was zealous for his administration, for the hierarchy, and with that object in view he succeeded and made no mistake. Mistaken zeal sounds like a palliation. When Peter said, "I wot that through ignorance ye did it as did also your rulers" he did not retract the charge, "Whom ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." It was fear of the Donatists, the fear the Jewish rulers expressed when they said, "Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? Behold the world is gone after him," that overcame Augustine. He had no idea of sav-

ing the souls of the Donatists when he delivered them over to the officers of the Imperial government. It was a convenient method of his to stop the escape of his sheep into another fold. Great as he was he was not great enough to follow Christ and the Apostles in the administration of the Church.

Whatever may be said in favor of the early church, and much may be said, it cannot rub out the bloody spot of persecution. It's a bad thing when a wicked deed of the present or of the past, of King or Pope, of high or of low, is condoned. The Popes had difficult problems to meet but they sinned grievously when they called on the civil power to take part in spiritual warfare. It is said that a hard case breaks down the law. The Donatists were Augustine's hard case and he broke with Christ and the gospel of love rather than lose it. Under him the church, which had been a schoolmaster, yielded to the devil's temptation of power and became a tyrant.

The wicked combination between church and state was never satisfactory to either side. There was an age-long conflict over investiture, that is whether pope or king had the right to invest the bishops with office and thereby held a claim upon their obedience. This struggle would not down, with alternate triumphs and defeats, now with the Emperor Henry IV, a penitent at the feet of Gregory VII at Canossa in the year 1076, and then with the same Pope his prisoner in Rome. But for a thousand years the church remained a department of the state, the police department, the secret service department of the state. The church tried and condemned heretics and the state executed the sentence. Thomas Aquinas, known as the angelic doctor, and especially commended by Leo XIII to priests for study and imitation, said, "counterfeiters are executed. Why should not heretics, who are worse than counterfeiters, be executed?" The mighty Innocent III established the Inquisition in the year 1208, and the very next year it was put into effect by the massacre of

the Albigenses. Any king who failed to put the Pope's decree into execution was placed under the ban. The guilty Innocent was foiled in England where the barons led the "army of God" against King John and, at Runnymede, wrung from him the Magna Charta with all the old English liberties. The Pope put the Island under an interdict but "habeas corpus" and "no taxation without representation" were not disturbed by it. The Inquisition was forbidden in England for two hundred years so that John Wyklif, though condemned as a heretic, died in his own bed. Boniface VIII surpassed Innocent in pride and haughtiness. Seated on his throne, girt with a sword and crowned with a triple crown, he proclaimed, "I am Cæsar, I am Emperor." But pride goes before a fall for Boniface became a prisoner of Philip le Bel at Anagni near Rome and died of a broken heart.

The ever increasing papal claims of territorial dominion and secular power were resisted by kings and emperors. Charlemagne made good his right to investiture and his veto of papal bulls in France. This was the basis of the famous Gallican liberties which, like the English liberties, saved the ecclesiastics of these countries from ultra-montanism, the extreme views of the papal court. So Saint Louis allowed no levy of money for the Pope without royal consent. The ultramontanists, or papal party, were called Guelphs, and the Imperial or secular party were known as Ghibellines. These two parties had their defenders in the universities, in the schoolmen. Aquinas, in his effort to exalt the papal power, sought to undermine the power of kings. Popes rule by divine right, he said, by the grace of God; not so kings. The state, Gregory VII declared, is the kingdom of the devil. What power the state has is a grant from the church. The rights of the people were transferred to Christ and by Him to Peter and by Peter to the Popes. Aquinas claimed that all political authority is derived from popular suffrage and that all laws must be made by the people

or their representatives. *There can be no security, he said, if we depend on the will of another man. Thus in his determination to undermine the power of kings he laid down the principles of natural right, of popular sovereignty, and of the Declaration of Independence.

Occam, the Ghibelline, magnified popular rights against the absolute authority of the Pope. He appealed to the General Council of the church as supreme. He agreed with Aquinas that the people's choice is the basis of royal authority. It was with the people's consent that Charlemagne was crowned. The people are the State. Dante, another Ghibelline, made bold to say that the king is for the people and not the people for the king.

He said: "To the crozier the sword is joined, and ill beseebeth it."

But the most outspoken advocate of liberty in the Middle Ages was a Jurist, Marsilius of Padua. Men are equal, he said, and it is wrong that one should be bound by laws made by another. No man should be punished for his religious opinions. The state is limited in its powers. The citizens should determine what should be done or omitted in civil affairs. Persecution is neither necessary, useful nor advisable. The Scriptures teach us to instruct, to persuade, but not to constrain or to punish.

There were various events that gradually undermined the authority of the persecuting Popes. The permanent schism between East and West destroyed the thought of the unity of the Church. The power of that idea was lost. The removal of the Holy See to Avignon shook the very foundations of the Papacy. The encroachments of the Arabs on Western Europe, with their Oriental ideas popularized by Averroes, called attention to another form of monotheism, and suggested the thought of a religion that would embrace Christian, Jew and Mohammedan. Abelard with his treatise entitled "*Sic et Non*," showed that anything could be proved from the writings of the

*Lord Acton, *Lectures on Liberty*, p. 36.

Church Fathers. The Crusades introduced new interests which weaned the world from the Church. The rise of free cities, whose extensive commerce depended on the cultivation of good feeling, made persecution most inconvenient. The Renaissance, with its revival of pagan art and culture, was the signal for widespread scepticism which cared not for the Church, but got along with it the best way that it could. Finally the discovery of the sea route to India, East and West, followed by inventions and by new sciences, aroused Europe from abstraction to reality.

Just before the long delayed Reformation burst forth, two events occurred which indicated the conflicting views that were held north and south of the Alps. In 1487, Pope Boniface VIII ordered a crusade against the peaceful Waldenses of Savoy. In 1515, Sir Thomas More published his "Utopia," a vision of an ideal commonwealth. "In Utopia government is based on the consent of the governed, as all power originates in the people. There are different religions but all revere the supreme Being. Only those who believe in the Future Life and the Judgment Day are eligible to office. Those who would persecute others are enslaved or banished from the Republic. No violence is permitted and nothing but fair and gentle speech is used. It is lawful for every man, as long as he is peaceable, to follow any religion that he pleases. Truth of its own power will at last issue out and come to light." It is difficult to assign a place, in the conflict between freedom and oppression, to More, for he was a member of the cabinet of Henry VIII which put William Tyndal, the translator of the New Testament, to death, and harried the Anabaptists out of the kingdom.

In doing this he was carrying out the policy of the Pope who cried angrily about the outbreak of the Reformation, in 1520: "If laws against heretics had been enforced we would have been saved all this trouble."

But the Reformers were no better and no worse than

Thomas More for they betrayed the liberty which they had at first defended. What nobler defence can be found than in the words of Luther? In the preface to the edition of the "Letters of John Huss"; he says: "The Papists burned the heretics because they were not able to answer their writings. If killing is confuting then the hangman is the best theologian." Heresy is a spiritual thing, he said, which no iron can hew down, no fire can burn and no water can drown. One of Luther's 95 theses read, "The burning of heretics is against the will of the Holy Spirit."¹ In 1520, he addressed Christian nobles with these words, "We should conquer heretics with writings not with fire."² Two years later he exclaimed, "I will preach, talk and write, but I will not violently force and compel any one, for faith is willing and unconstrained and must be received without compulsion."³ In 1523, he demanded: "What does the Elector count in religious matters? Why do we inquire of him? He has the say only in secular affairs. If he wished to take more we would say, 'Dear Sir, attend to your own department.' " In 1524, he wrote, "There must be sects. Let the minds of men clash together. If some are misled, that's the way in war. Some must fall wounded but he who fights honestly will be crowned. Let everyone teach and believe what he will, the truth or a lie; all the government can do is to prevent incitement to war and riot."⁴ "If you bid me believe and forbid me to read books, I will not obey. For then you are a tyrant and strike too high, commanding where you have neither right nor power. God's word must fight with heresy. If that fails secular power will fail even if it fills the world with blood."⁵ As late as 1527, he wrote, "It is not right and it is really grievous to me that the miserable Anabaptists are murdered and

¹Works, Weimar ed. vol. 1, p. 624.

²Works, Weimar ed. vol. 6, p. 455.

³Works, Weimar ed. vol. 10, p. 2-18.

⁴Works, Weimar ed. vol. 12, p. 649.

⁵Works, Weimar ed. vol. 15, p. 218; vol. 18, p. 299.

⁶Works, vol. 11, p. 262.

burned to death. Every one should be allowed to believe what he will. Oppose them with writing and the word of God.”⁷ Luther remembered that he and his books had been condemned by the Diet of Worms to the flames.

Zwingli too gave promise at first of being a friend of liberty for he wrote in 1523, “God will not advance his truth by the sword for Jesus said to Peter, ‘Put up again thy sword into his place. For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.’ It will not do to blame the enemies of the Word of God for using violence if we use it.”⁸ John Brenz, the Reformer of Wurtemberg, in 1528 raised the question, “Has the State the right to execute the Anabaptists with fire and sword?” “Persecution only increases sects,” he said, “let the Gospel contend with heresy. If heresy can be prevented by the sword there is no need to study the scriptures. It is better to tolerate error ten times than to persecute the truth once.” Bullinger, Zwingli’s successor, defended faith as a free gift of God that cannot be forced. “Truth is able to win,” he said.

Yet, as N. Paulus proves in his “Protestanism and Toleration in the Sixteenth Century,” every one of the Reformers, even those whose liberality has been praised, advocated persecution. I called Phillips Brooks’ attention to the error in his “Lectures on Tolerance” in praising Zwingli for his humane views. He acknowledged his mistake though he had the support of Hallam and Lecky¹, and the error survives in Ruffini.² As a matter of fact Zwingli tortured Hübmeier and secured the death of Felix Mantz by drowning.³

In like manner J. W. Baum in his “Life of Capito,”⁴ Reformer of Strassburg, boasts of the “Christian tolerance established at Strassburg, a tolerance which, after

⁷Works, vol 26, p. 125.

⁸Zwingli’s Works, new ed., vol. 11, p. 451.

¹History of Rationalism, vol. 11, p. 35.

²Religious Liberty, vol. 1, p. 67.

³Egli, *Aktensammlung*, p. 1071.

⁴Page 377.

a battle of three centuries, has passed as one of the noblest achievements into the laws of many Christian nations." Yet it was Capito who advised the magistrates of Strassburg that families which waited more than eight days before bringing their infants to be baptized should be banished. The general German Biography in referring to the Reformer of Basel says, "Men like to speak of the mild evangelical sentiments of Oecolampadius, one of the phrases which without investigation pass from book to book."⁵ The magistrates over-ruled Oecolampadius when they ordered that "Every one's belief should be free and no one constrained or compelled to hear this sermon or that. Everything is to be left to every man's conscience."⁶

Hübmeier, the Baptist martyr, maintained that "while the government has the right to punish a wicked man it has no right to punish a godless man. Burning a heretic appears to be a confession of Christ, but really it is a denial of him. Heretics who cannot be converted by appeal to reason or the Word of God should be left alone." Servetus, the anti-trinitarian martyr, wrote: "Christians treat those who differ from them not only with most bitter hatred and contumely but also with exquisite torture and horrible punishment. This is not done privately, but in the name of the Church. This slaughter of the Innocents is the eternal disgrace of the Church. We thought that a benign God had removed this yoke from our necks and that the most pleasant light of liberty was shining when suddenly it looked as if God had repented of his benefits. He had begun to restore liberty but we preferred servitude. For the domination which others had exercised over us we began to exercise over others as if we objected not to the servitude of others but to their domination over us." In his commentary on Psalm 120, Butzer of Strassburg, remarks: "It is a Baptist error

⁵Egli, *Aktensammlung*, p. 622.

⁶Basler Chroniken, vol. 1, p. 55.

to say that the magistrate should allow every one to believe what he pleases as long as he does not disturb the peace." It is unneighborly to kill or banish heretics and it is too expensive to imprison them, we should put them to work as the Huns and Turks do with their prisoners.⁷

There were some who were not Baptists who adopted their liberal views. Such were Sebastian Franck, the historian, and Caspar Schwenckfeld, both mystics, who anticipated the teachings of George Fox and the Quakers. Franck defended liberty from the very nature of faith. Schwenckfeld reminded the Reformers how they had clamored for the freedom of faith for themselves though now they deny it to others.¹ Bullinger, Zwingli's successor at Zürich, replied: "What is more disgraceful than what Schwenckfeld says, that there will be no good as long as faith is not free. Oh, what inconsiderate speech from this man for if every faith is free then truth must perish."² Christoph Ehem, a patrician of Augsburg, uttered this noble sentiment, "No follower of Christ or servant of the Gospel should stir up the secular authority in matters of faith, much less should the magistrate himself mix in such affairs."³ Jacob Schorr, chancellor of the Palatinate, and three humanists of Strassburg, Auto Engelbrecht, Wolfgang Schultheiss, and Jacob Ziegler, deserve honorable mention as friends of liberty when friends were few.⁴

How few those friends were in the sixteenth century became manifest when Servetus was burned alive at Geneva in 1553. This abominable cruelty aroused so much indignation that Calvin, the chief instigator of it, felt compelled to justify himself. "What evil have I done," he asked, "if the Council, to be sure by my advice, but according to the counsel of different churches, executed

⁷*Zeitschrift f. Kirchen geschichte*, 1885, p. 492.

¹Schwenckfeld Corpus, vol. IV, p. 130.

²Pestalozzi, *Life of Leo Juda*, p. 47.

³Paulus, p. 144.

⁴Paulus, p. 118, p. 129.

vengeance on this dreadful blasphemer? What shall I say of the cruel mildness of those who spare the wolves and expose the sheep to destruction?"⁵ This defence was signed by all the pastors of Geneva.⁶ Melanchthon wrote, "I praise your piety and decision, and wonder that there are men who blame you for your sternness. The magistrates of Geneva have, in burning Servetus, given to all posterity a devout and memorable example." Forty-nine preachers, meeting in the County of Mansfield in 1559, justified the *auto da fe*. N. Paulus is authority for the statement that there was no Lutheran theologian in the 16th century who condemned it. "We do not punish faith but heresy," Melanchthon said, we compel not the mental, but the locomotive part of man."⁸

A monument of expiation has been erected at Geneva, with this inscription, "The sons of Calvin but condemning an error which was that of his century, and family attached to liberty of conscience according to the true principles of the Reformation and of the Gospel, erect this monument." But as F. Loofs says, "Calvin cannot be excused by the age in which he lived because there were some men who lived above the age."⁷

One of these was Castellio of Basel who translated the Bible first into Latin, then into French. In the preface to his Latin Bible which he dedicated in 1551 to King Edward VI of England he says: "With sword and flame and water men rage against the weak and defenseless. They say it is not permitted to us to put any one to death but we deliver him up to Pilate and if he refuses we cry, 'You're no friend of Cæsar,' and most infamous of all we claim to do this by the command and in the name of Christ. We cover the fierce wolf with sheep's clothing. We are sanguinary in the name of him who, to save the

⁵Calvin Opera, vol IX, p. 575.

⁶Paulus, p. 243.

⁷Corpus Ref. vol. VII, p. 523 and vol. IX, p. 133.

⁸Corpus Ref. vol. XVI, p. 573.

¹Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1910, p. 115.

blood of others, shed his own. We persecute in zeal for him who said, 'If they smite thee on one cheek turn the other also.' " After the burning of Servetus, Castellio wrote a book against persecution, using the pseudonym, Martin Bellius. "Who would become a Christian," he asked, "when he sees Christians murdered by Christians without pity, treated worse than brigands or murderers? One would think that Christ were some Moloch when he sees so many burned alive in his honor." On the title page is found the Scripture text, 'He that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born of the spirit, even so it is now.' I know certain theologians, he said, who, when in peril, cried out against the inquisition of conscience but now they indorse what they formerly condemned. The coercion of conscience produces hypocrisy and wounds the conscience because whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Satan likes to sow tares in the newly broken ground of the Reformation. He has begun to sow bad seed and under pretence of piety he eradicates heretics. It is a false idea that men may be persecuted for religion. This false idea is the real heresy. The Anabaptists, with their communistic notions, may be dangerous but they should be left alone until they put such ideas into execution. They should not be interfered with as long as they keep within the law. The blood of the Anabaptists cries to Heaven." After reading such statements as these it is surprising to find in the same book this sentiment; "An errorist, one who denies the resurrection, should be excommunicated and if he persists in his error he should be punished but not by death. If fines accomplish nothing let him be banished. If he returns he may be cast into prison but nothing worse should be done to him."² Castellio's pupil, Faustus Socinus, exhibits the same self contradiction. He says; "Obstinate heretics should properly be restrained by the magistrate from spreading their errors and, if it cannot be done otherwise, by chains

²Paulus, p. 252.

and imprisonment; you observe that I speak of obstinate heretics." Neither Castellio nor Socinus could free himself from the universal prejudice that error is a crime and must be punished. They did not take the bold position of the Anabaptists that truth is a match for error and asks for no odds.

Beza, successor to Calvin, replied to Castellio, "This is a pestilent opinion, he said, for heretics are far worse than patricides. Shall a Christian government be weaker than a pagan? It is known that the Athenians put atheists to death. If we do not punish heretics we go against the Bible and the authority of the centuries. This is a devil's dogma to allow any one who wishes, to plunge into eternal perdition. Not only heretics but also those who object to their punishment ought to be made to suffer."¹

The Swiss Confession of 1536, says, "The Anabaptists who listen to no warnings but persist in their errors should be punished to prevent them from poisoning the flock of God with their false doctrines."² The Helvetic Confession of 1562, which was adopted in Holland, in Scotland and in Hungary expressly declares that heretics should be put to the sword. The French Creed held to the same cruel views so that in every state of Europe at that time, whether Lutheran or Reformed, heresy was treated as a crime. A truce between Lutherans and Roman Catholics was established in 1555. It was called the Peace of Augsburg and produced a slight amelioration in conditions. For instance banishment, euphemistically called benefit of emigration, was substituted for burning. The Protestants of Holland were explicitly excluded from the benefit of this peace. By this treaty territorialism was systematically applied to religion. A prince could change his religion and compel his subjects to change with him. The region determined the religion. Under this

¹Paulus, pp. 257 and 263.

²Mittler, *Reformed Creeds*, p. 108.

pact Henry of Valois was elected King of Poland. When he refused to sign it the nobles said, "If you will not take the oath you cannot take the throne." He surrendered Poland but became King of France. Prof. Jerome Zanchius of Heidelberg, in his *Confession of Faith*, published in the year 1585, expressly condemned the error of the Anabaptists who contend that civil power should not compel any one to believe but that every one should be free to confess the religion which pleases him best."³ The jurists of Saxony objected to the action of Heidelberg in burning to death a recanting heretic named Sylvanus. "It was right to put him to death," they remarked, "but seeing that he had recanted he should not have been put to the flames. It would have been better to have beheaded him."⁴

At this period of mutual recrimination and almost incessant religious and civil war a few voices were raised for religious peace. Ochino, a favorite of Edward VI, published his dialogues which are a storehouse of arguments against persecution, and Acontio another Italian, an engineer, appealed to Queen Elizabeth for the gentle treatment of dissenters. Giordano Bruno published in 1577, a denunciation of Geneva for its treatment of Servetus. A more famous advocate of conciliation was a Roman Catholic with a Protestant wife, the grand chancellor of France l'Hopital.

He prevented in 1560, the introduction of the Inquisition into France, and in 1562, he obtained from Catherine de Medici an edict of toleration and emptied the prisons of Huguenots. "We may kill, exile or free them, he said; humanity, reason and religion favor the third alternative. Assail the Huguenots with the arms of charity and prayer and of persuasion and of the word of God, arms proper for such combat." He left office when Catherine, despite his entreaties, yielded to the demands of the Spanish butcher, the Duke of Alva, and ordered, on

³Zanchius, vol. VIII, p. 555.

⁴Paulus, p. 319.

the night of St. Bartholomew, in the year 1572, the massacre of the Huguenots. The clergy, who were the largest landowners in the country, made frequent benevolent donations to relieve the constant needs of the royal treasury, but always demanded a continuation of the war of extermination against the "Pretended Reformed Religion."

In the midst of the furious civil war that followed the massacre, three famous Frenchmen protested against the fratricidal strife. Montaigne, in one of his essays, dropped this aphorism: "It is rating our opinions high to roast other people alive for them. It is true that liberty arouses dissension but it is also true that liberty calms dissension." Jean Bodin, in his "*De Republica*," denied the right of a king to use violence to compel his subjects to embrace any religion. He introduced ethics into politics and opposed the pessimism of Machiavelli. He set up justice as the firmest pillar of the state. Power is only deposited with the Prince, it does not belong to him. He is not superior to justice and the laws of God. He may not use force to prevent religious discussion and division. Fr. Hotman, who escaped at the time of the massacre, a famous jurist, advocated majority rule and the election of kings as well as of parliaments.

In the year 1598, Henry IV issued the famous Edict of Nantes which granted the Huguenots limited religious rights with full civil rights. He had been a Huguenot, but the Huguenots opposed the edict because it tolerated the idolatry of the Mass. He was a Roman Catholic, but Romanists opposed the edict because it gave a measure of toleration to the "Pretended Reformed Religion." Pope Clement VIII issued a Bull to nullify the edict but Henry called the Pope's words clouds of wind without thunder or lightning. He appealed to both factions to tolerate each other under the ægis of the law. "You can't convert men by using violent measures, he said. The dissensions between Roman Catholics and Huguenots must

cease and all must be good Frenchmen." This edict, enforced as it was after Henry's death, first by Richelieu and then by Mazarin, introduced the grand century of French art and literature. DeThou, in the preface to his *Universal History*, dedicated to Henry, says, "You have combined liberty and sovereignty. Experience teaches that the sword, flames, exile and proscription rather irritate than heal a diseased mind. Teaching and sedulous instruction distil softly and drop into the mind. Religion is not subject to command for it enters minds prepared by divine grace with the knowledge of the truth. Under thee war is not a legitimate mode of ending the schism of the Church."

The Huguenot Synod of Gap in 1603, declared the Pope to be Anti-Christ, but at Henry's request this statement was not published. "Our king makes no martyrs," said Cardinal Duperron. "He leaves the souls of his subjects free."

The era of religious toleration introduced into little Holland by William the Silent was accompanied by a similar display of wealth, learning and art. It became the center of the world's learning with its Grotius and Scaliger, its Descartes and Spinoza, and of the world's art with its Hals and Rembrandt, and of the world's theology with its Arminius, Episcopius and Limborch, and of the world's science with its Huyghens. When William became governor of Holland in 1572, he announced as his program, the freedom of religion. Everybody shall exercise it freely in private and in public, in church and in chapel. No one shall trouble his neighbor but live frank and free, in peace and repose with God. William was opposed in this program by both Protestant and Catholic, but he replied, "I have laid down the rule that as long as a man obeys the laws of the country, no matter what his religion, he shall be protected." In 1582, the magistrates of Leyden issued this edict: "We have said before, we still persist in saying it, and, by God's grace, we hope to continue till death, that we can agree to no re-

ligious persecution, however trifling it may be. Freedom allows to every one the free expression of his feelings." The Prince was strongly supported by the liberal theologian Cornhert, who said, "Unity is excellent when freely accepted but when force is used to maintain it it means perpetual slaughter." He appealed thus to the survivors of the War with Spain. "Why did we pour out our blood? For religious liberty. Then let every one have the right to say what he thinks of religion and of everything else."

THE CHALLENGE OF AN UNFINISHED WORLD.

W. R. CULLOM, D.D., WAKE FOREST COLLEGE.

Dr. Henry Louis Smith, the distinguished president of Washington and Lee University, has a famous lecture on "The Life and Death of a World." In this lecture Dr. Smith supports the thesis that worlds have their birth, infancy, childhood, mature life, old age and death, just as individual men have. According to this theory, the moon has run its course and is now dead. Certain of the planets are yet in their infancy, while the earth, the globe on which we live, is yet in the making, and furnishes an opportunity for each succeeding generation to get in on the ground floor, so to speak, as partners in the creative process.

THE TWO CONCEPTIONS.

This suggests two conceptions of the world about us which stand over against each other, and to which attention is called in this paper. In one case, we think of the world as being in a fluid state and as yet in the making. In the other, we think of the world as being in a crystalized state and therefore as dead and unresponsive. Much depends on which of these concepts holds a controlling place in a man's mind.

Who does not recall his childish reading of that magnificent first chapter of Genesis? The Creator spake the word and the sun flashed out in all his glory, rejoicing "as a strong man to run a race."

He spake again and the earth and the planets stood out and began their age-long courses round and round in their respective orbits. He spake finally and the clods of dirt began to crawl together and shape themselves into the form of a human being. It was a little hard to see why the Creator should take a whole day to speak this being into existence, except that perhaps it took quite a little while for the piece of human mud to dry out. Be

this as it may, that was the way we saw the matter of creation. The Creator spake the word and the world as we know it, stood fast—signed, sealed, pigeon-holed and ready for use.

“And God saw all that he had made and Behold, it was very good.” Which, in geometrical language, would be read, Q. E. D. The job was perfect. Nothing remained but for the man to step out on the second day of his existence as the perfect lord of creation. This is the view of the little child who has a fancy that all papa has to do is to reach out his magical hand into the atmosphere about him, and whatever he may call for, comes to him without effort out of the land of fairydom. It is the view of the sacrifice of Jesus held by the man who said: Jesus paid it all, and therefore a man need not pay his honest debts. Later the child begins to realize that every comfort he enjoys has cost his father toil and sweat. Later still it begins to dawn on him that his father is working out a great ideal, and that the highest task set before himself is to fall in line with this ideal and help his father to realize it. The man who thought the sacrifice of Jesus released him from obligation, comes to understand that this sacrifice has placed on him an obligation that is as deep as the stain and guilt of the sin from which he has been delivered; as high as the holy ideal which Jesus has set for himself and for His followers; and as sacred as the eternal love of God which is the originating cause of it all. Too many of us have a sort of confused, double conception of God. At one time, we are deists, thinking of Him as a far-away director of the universe, a sort of absentee-landlord; at another time, we are theists to the nth degree. That is, we think of God as interfering in the affairs of our world very much after the manner of the fairies of the folk-lore tales. I do not think that either conception is a normal or wholesome one.

But to come back to the two conceptions of the world about which we are speaking. . . The static and the fluid,

the mechanical and the dynamic—the living, expanding, growing world; or the dead, inert, drifting world. According as a man takes the one or the other of these attitudes of life, he will be a passive instrument carried on as so much drift-wood in the dreary, prosaic routine of nature; or he will become an active, intelligent agent in an ever unfolding series of wonders that far surpass anything that we used to discover in our childhood visits to fairyland. A man's attitude here determines whether he is to be a cog in a wheel, or a partner in the business. Sometime ago a man asked me to explain to him who was involved in the statement: "Let *us* make man in our image after our likeness." I told him I had heard it said that this was spoken by the Father to the other two persons in the Trinity. Now I believe most heartily and devoutly in the Christian doctrine of a Triune-God, but I must confess that there was always something apparently forced and artificial in the explanation which has been suggested. At any rate, this was my reply to my questioner: "I think that God is saying that to you and me today, and He will be saying it to every generation of men and women that may come upon the earth on to the end. The words of the Bible come from an ever-living God. Therefore, they are and forever will be perpetually contemporaneous. This great saying: "Let us make man in our image," and make him after the very pattern of God's own likeness, is a challenge to every man in every worthy calling under the sun. This is today the very heart of the challenge of an unfinished world.

AN AGE-LONG FIGHT.

Among the people through whom the Bible has come to us, the races of the earth were divided into two classes, Jews and Gentiles. Among the Gentiles there were of course many and conspicuous thinkers along that line that we are considering. If we look for the people who thought most clearly and most deeply on any subject our minds

would perhaps at once turn to the Greeks. Here we find exactly what I am suggesting. Their early thinkers struggled with the question as to what is the ultimate element. One says it is water, another says it is fire, still another says it is the air about us. And they begin to discuss the question as to the course of things. Heraclitus said that all things are in flux, nothing is fixed. We are constantly moving from one thing to another. We are in a growing universe. Over against him were Xenophanes, Parmenides and the Eleatic school, who held the opposite view, namely, that the world is stationary. In Egypt, in China, in India, in Japan, in a large part of the world, this static conception held sway for many generations. They were tied to a dead past, and perhaps would have remained in this state but for a new breath breathed into them out of the chosen nation.

If we turn to Israel we find the conflict goes on here, but through this nation has come to the world over and over again revolution after revolution that has turned men's gaze away from the narrow, localized, crystallized conception of God and the world to the brighter, fuller, richer conception. A few simple illustrations, taken more or less at random, will have to serve my purpose here. Suppose we look at this chosen people at the opening of the sixth century, B. C., Jeremiah is God's mouthpiece in Jerusalem. Around him stands a nation that believed that God had shut Himself into this one place; to destroy Jerusalem, therefore, was almost the same thing as destroying God Himself. Imagine the awe and terror with which the people were struck when this prophet came to them boldly declaring that Jerusalem must fall. Imagine a preacher in one of our Southern states in the year 1860, declaring boldly that slavery must go. His position and that of Jeremiah might well be compared. Israel had localized their God. They had the static conception of the world. Jeremiah was the one man among them who had caught the true meaning of it all. The little drama that

was being enacted about them was only a small, insignificant part of a greater plan which God was working out. Hence it was in this conviction that Jeremiah could lift his head above the dust and confusion of the time and give expression to such words as these:

“Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his brother, saying know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity and I will remember their sin no more.” (Jer. 31:31-34.)

His contemporary, Ezekiel, was doing the same thing for the exiles in Babylon. Look at two of the magnificent pictures which he draws. Remember that he is surrounded by the same frame of mind as that which obtained in Jerusalem. The devout ones around Him were saying: “How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.” (Ps. 137:4-6).

They felt that God was in Jerusalem and that He could not be found elsewhere. In the first chapter of Ezekiel’s prophecy, you will recall the great vision of the beasts looking in all directions, and of the wheel within a wheel, moving this way and that. What a splendid conception! And hear the prophet as he proclaims:

“This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.” (Ezek. 1:28.)

God was just as truly among His people in Babylon as ever He had been in Jerusalem, and the tender figures of speech that Ezekiel uses to describe God's watchcare over His people ought to have brought solid assurance to every real believer in God. Look once again at Ezekiel's picture of the valley of dry bones. How the two conceptions that we are considering stand over against each other in this picture! The bones are dry, very dry. The prophet speaks in the name of his God and flesh and skin come on the bones. Spirit comes into them. They live and move and have a being. Some prosaic literalist might say that the prophet is here speaking literally, did he not make his own explanation? Hear him as he declares:

"These bones are the whole house of Israel; Behold they say, our bones are dried and our hope is lost: we are completely cut off." (Ezek. 37:11.)

The last illustration taken from the Old Testament is that of Job. To begin with, Job and his friends, all hold to this crystallized view of God and His world. But in the crucible of suffering all things are sifted. In the darkest hour theoretical formulas did not satisfy the heroic soul of this man who was willing to face the truth at any cost. The book is a history of a struggle between the two ideas resulting finally in a first hand knowledge of God on the part of Job. Job's patience was not a passive submission to whatever might befall him. He raised questions. He even interrogated the Almighty over and over again. He begs that the Almighty sound the very depths of his soul. He wanted truth in the inward part. His patience consisted in his holding on to the end, and in the end as has been said, he met God face to face. God was no longer one who was far away. He was a God who was in the rain, in the clouds, in history, in nature, in human life—a God who was all about him, touching him gloriously and helpfully in every way. This, to my mind, is the central point in this poem which Thomas Carlyle characterizes as the greatest production in existence.

If we pass into the New Testament we find the same process going on there. The Pharisees, the religious leaders in the time of Jesus, held the crystallized view gone to seed. With them the real juice of the Bible, of the world about them, of everything, had been squeezed out, and all was as dry as the dust of the desert and as dead as all the traditional door nails. Over against this dead orthodoxy, with the emphasis on the *dead*, Jesus comes to breathe out the very breath of God. When they accused Him of breaking the law, in healing a poor, impotent man on the Sabbath, hear Him as He makes His defense, in the memorable words:

“My Father worketh hitherto and I work.” (John 5:17.)

Hear Him again as He speaks of His own relationship to the past:

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.” (Matt. 5:17.)

Hear Him once again as He would stir His disciples to take hold just when and where they were and do their level best:

“Say not ye there are yet four months and then cometh harvest? Behold I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together. And herein is that saying true, one soweth and another reapeth. I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labor: other men labored and ye are entered into their labors.” (John 4:35-38.)

In his delightful little book, “The Manhood of the Master,” Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, says this:

“The world to him (Jesus), was a story that has a plot with progress in it, and a climax. All the philosophic cycles become in his thoughts spirals, that seeming to be

turning on themselves move ever higher toward the summit. This is the inward soul of Jesus' preaching. God is purposing his Kingdom here. We are therefore like soldiers doing battle under a great general. We do not even understand all the Supernal diplomacy that has made this war necessary. That is the General's affair, not ours. *Our business is to fight under orders and help make every generation's battle another skirmish won in God's campaign.* We shall not do the ultimate winning; he must do that, and he will. He will wind up the age-long campaign some day with a strategic move that will startle heaven and earth together, and like Von Moltke at Sedan, catch the world's Napoleon in an unescapable trap. 'Watch, says Jesus, and again I say unto you, watch, the kingdom of God is at hand.' "

If we look into the further development of the New Testament we find this same conflict going on. Who can read the great speech of Stephen before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, follow him through the successive ages of his people's history until he came to the building of the temple, and hear his matchless climax, without feeling that he is laying the ax to the very tap root of this crystallized conception of God and his world? Hear him as he says:

"But Solomon built him a house. Howbeit the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me, saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hands made all these things?" (Acts 7:47-50.)

If we follow the career of the great Apostle Paul we find that his whole life as a Christian was one constant warfare in fighting for the principle which we are discussing. Of course he was reared a Pharisee and shared with them most heartily and conscientiously all the fossilized rigidity of their view. When he caught his heavenly vision, however, and began to follow it, old things at

once passed away and all things became new. God was no longer the far-away absentee landlord alluded to in an earlier paragraph of this paper, but he came to see that: "In him we live and move and have our being." Tennyson, in his Higher Pantheism, was no more conscious of God's ever abiding presence in and with all his creatures than was this devout Apostle of Jesus. He could stand in the synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia, review the history of his own people and show them without question or quibble that God's hand had been working through the ages toward a climax which he saw reached in Jesus of Nazareth. He could turn then to the Gentiles, a few days later, and declare to them that even there God had not left Himself without witness:

"In that he did good, giving you rains from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with gladness." So deeply and sweetly conscious was Paul of this great truth that he could see the hand of God reversing the efforts of his enemies to destroy his work. Hear him as he writes from his prison in Rome:

"But I would have you understand, brethren, that my affairs have really tended to the progress of the gospel; so that my bonds for Christ are manifest in all Cæsar's court and to all others. And most of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident in my bonds are much more bold to speak the word without fear." (Phil. 1:12-14.)

Nay more, so deep, so broad, so high, so far reaching, did this truth become with him that he began to see every pain and ache and sorrow of the individual; every revolution and war and upheaval among the nations; every famine, earthquake and pestilence in the history of the earth; every experience and incident of animate and inanimate life, as a part of God's working towards his final goal. He could personify the world about him and say about this as he said about himself:

"I do not count myself to have laid hold of it, but one thing I do, forgetting the things behind and reaching

forth to the things before, I pursue on toward the mark for the prize of the heavenly calling of God in Christ Jesus." (Phil. 3:13, 14.)

There are some texts in the Bible that I have never yet dared to preach from. I am hoping sometime to be able to do so. I name one of these texts in this connection. It is Romans 8:19-22: "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly but by reason of him who hath made it subject in hope. For the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

The bleeding nations of Europe may not be able to see it now, but it helps me at this distance to be assured that their groans and sighs are an essential part of this travelling in pain, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.

Who has read Luke's matchless account of the early Acts of the Apostles without feeling at the end of Chapter 28 that the account was incomplete? Of course it was incomplete; and is and shall be incomplete for many ages to come. There are many passages in the old Book that startle me the more I read them. One of these is to be found in the last two verses of the 11th chapter of Hebrews. If the author of that chapter could come back to the earth today and bring that roll call of the faithful down to date, would he not still have to add these two verses as an appendix? If he should come back a thousand years or a million years from now, and did the same thing, would he not still have to add these last two verses as an appendix, and so on to the end? Hear these two verses:

'And these all having obtained a good testimony through faith, received not the promise: God having pro-

vided some better things for us that they without us should not be made perfect."

So the conflict between these two conceptions goes on throughout the New Testament. Jesus saw it; Paul saw it; the author of the Book of Hebrews saw it; the Book of Revelation is a beautiful panoramic picture of this conflict. What a magnificent task was handed on to the Christian church by these New Testament Christians!

"Thy saints in all this glorious war
Shall conquer though they die.
They view the triumph from afar,
By faith they bring it nigh."

If we turn to the history of the Christian Church and trace the course of the two conceptions that we have been discussing, through the Christian centuries we shall find that what was true in the Old Testament times and throughout the making of the New Testament, has been equally true through all the Christian centuries. Mohammedanism is a younger religion than Christianity, and has triumphed mightily over much of the earth. But its triumph cannot be final. It has tied itself to the civilization of the 7th century, and is trying to chain the onward march of God to the type of civilization which the founder saw about him. If I were a cartoonist I think I could make a picture worth while, in showing the prophet of Mecca trying to throttle the expanding life of God in men and to chain the ongoing of God's march through the centuries to his own little insignificant section of the eternal ages. The stars in their courses fight against Mohammed.

Among the Christian people the same effort has been made. Here a number of interesting cartoons could be made of the holy fathers sitting in solemn conclave, declaring that thus and so is the last word that God shall utter on a given subject. All hath been said, therefore, seal up the word in the form of a creed that shall be declared to be true everywhere among all nations, world without end, Amen.

“He that sits in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord will have them in derision.” Now don’t misunderstand me. Creeds are good things. A man without a creed is a man without a spinal column. But when a man tries to bottle up the Almighty in a little creed, he is trying to do a thing the like unto which the bottling up of lightning is a simple matter. The Word of God is quick and powerful and cannot be bound. We sometimes wonder why the Bible is given to us in what seems to us such a fragmentary way. I would remind you that when men plant an orchard, they put the trees in rows, equally distant from each other. When God plants a forest he does it in His own way—a way that never becomes stereotyped or monotonous, but will be fresh and suggestive so long as seed time and harvest, summer and winter, shall continue. For my part, I love God’s forest, and in the same way I love God’s Word.

But I have digressed. I was speaking about a conflict of ideas. Most of the wars of history have been religious wars. When reduced to their lowest terms, can we find one general theme around which all of them can be grouped? I am persuaded that we can, and that this theme would be identical with the one which we are now considering. What brought on the Reformation and the Thirty Years’ War that followed? What is the present world war about? No doubt there are causes economic, causes political, causes personal and perhaps many other causes. But if you will sift the matter to the bottom, I believe you will find that the systematic, persistent effort to hedge in the progress of the Almighty in His ongoing march toward the climax of His kingdom among men lies at the basis of it all. This is a general statement. Under the circumstances I shall have to leave you to work out the details. Suffice it to say, the conflict is still on. In church, in state, in social organization, by evil report and good report, in season and out of season, the effort is being made to write Q. E. D., and tell the Creator that He

must go no further. But the Kingdom of God is like the grain of mustard seed which has in it the potency of life. And life can never be held in by manufactured schemes. If it cannot come out in one form it will come out in another. Men may change the current of rivers, they may overcome the law of gravitation, they may harness the lightning, they may compel the very atmosphere about them to become subservient to their will, to carry their messages and do the work of the world. But no man can thwart the purpose of the Creator in this onward march of life. Hear the words of Jesus to that nation that sought in His day to put itself across the path of this mighty current:

“Did you never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: This is the Lord’s doing and it is marvelous in our eyes? Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: But on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.” (Matt. 21:42-44.)

To me this view of the world constitutes the most glorious challenge imaginable. It constitutes a new call for the prophet, the seer, the man who can read the past, the present and the future, in the light of this great truth and govern himself accordingly. It so vitalizes God’s eternal Word of Truth that if you cut one of these words you can almost see it bleed. It gives a new and ever-increasing significance to Paul’s great words in 1 Corinthians 3:9: “We are God’s fellow-workers.” It puts forever under the ban any occupation or calling that in any way thwarts the Creator in His beneficent purpose. It puts to the blush of shame the man or woman who is willing to live in the world as a sort of hobo on the chariot of social progress, the man who is willing to live in the world without performing his part of the world’s task and bearing his part of the world’s burden. It gives a

new definition to the distinction between the sacred and the secular. It is no longer a question of place or time or even of specialized person. The smith who sees his work and performs it in the spirit and with the motive of co-operation with God has a right to think of his task as being as holy as that of the man who stands behind the so-called sacred desk. And I am not saying this with the thought of making the desk less sacred but rather of making the shop more sacred. I went into a home the other day where the husband and father is a drunkard and a dooper. The little farm had just been sold and the family had moved into our town. The floors were bare and furniture was meager and dilapidated. A daughter had died a few weeks before and the old grandmother had just passed on to her reward. In the course of my conversation with the good old woman of the house, I remarked to her that she had been struck pretty hard of late. "Yes," said she, "if I look at it that way, but I am so thankful that I was able to help them." What could be more sacred than the work which that woman was doing? She will stand at last among those to whom the Master will say: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

POINTED SUGGESTIONS.

Let me offer a few pointed suggestions as to simple every-day matters in which this conflict has been helpful to me:

1. I name first among these the matter of *revelation*. Under the old rigid, static conception of God, many moral difficulties in the story of revelation had to remain among the insoluble mysteries of Providence, remain a constant challenge to intelligent faith, or the explanation had to be manufactured. Of course, this last alternative furnished a fine field for all sorts of mental gymnastics and in that way was no doubt useful. Under the conception that I am presenting, I do not believe that there is a single difficulty connected with God's revelation to men that does not find an explanation that is at once natural, reason-

able and even helpful to us in our own effort to apprehend the ways of God with ourselves and among men.

2. A second suggestion has reference to the *virgin birth of Jesus*. Of all the so-called theological dogmas, this is about the hardest for the rational type of mind to accept. And under the rigid, static view of the world, I confess it is fraught with difficulties. But under the view that we are discussing this great fact comes in as a natural climax to a series of startling events which had gone on before. In the theory of the unfolding process there came a time when life entered into inorganic matter. Later there entered the stream of life what we call self-consciousness. Later still there entered that mighty arbiter between right and wrong which we call conscience. Now I raise the question: Wherein is the story of the miraculous conception of Jesus in the womb of the Virgin and the doctrine of the Virgin birth of God into our life one whit more wonderful or incredible than the entrance of life itself, of self-consciousness and of conscience into this same stream of life? I have other reasons for believing most firmly in the virgin birth of Jesus but they would not be germane to my discussion this morning. I maintain that the one that I have just set forth is entirely in keeping with my subject, and to me brings this virgin birth into the natural sequence of supernatural things.

3. A third suggestion in this connection has reference to some of the *current isms* with which we have to deal. Take what is known as Christian Science, for an example. Who can deny that there is a power in this movement? What is the secret of its power? And how are we to deal with this remarkable phenomenon of our time? Now I make bold to assert that the one thing in Christian Science that gives it power with people is its teaching that God is a present reality—living, working, helping men here and now. There is something down deep in men's souls that cries out with the Psalmist for the living God; and when the church begins to feed men

on the husks of formalism, ritualism, or in any other way give them a stone for bread, some sort of ism will always break out against such a travesty on the ever-abounding goodness and helpfulness of God. The way to meet Christian Science, and to my mind the only way to meet it successfully, is for the followers of Jesus to come back ever and anon to that apostolic view of God and His world in which God is a river of life that flows on ever amongst the thirsty peoples of the earth, bringing life and blessing to thirsty souls everywhere.

Take Russellism as another example of what I am speaking of. To my mind it is not the doctrine of Russellism that is making it go. It is the method of its propaganda. Every adherent of this teaching becomes at once an ardent, enthusiastic propagandist. Compare this with the New Testament method of spreading the kingdom of God and you will find that the two are identical. Does not God allow such things to come amongst us as a rebuke to His church? Are not our churches reversing the command of Jesus which tells them to go to men and make disciples of them? Instead of obeying this order, too many churches, alas! are paying a man to stand in their pulpits on Sunday morning to entertain and edify the sleeping saints while a lost and ruined world drifts on to destruction. Do not misunderstand me again. I challenge any man to feel a higher appreciation for the church, the preacher, or the pulpit, than myself. What I am insisting on here is that our churches must catch a new vision of the function of the church and the pulpit in their relation to each other. Jesus did not lay upon the preachers the work of winning the lost world back to God. The preacher is to instruct, to inspire, to train and under the guidance of the Spirit, to direct his church in this campaign of saving those about them and of sending the good news on to the ends of the earth. I am longing to see one church start on such a campaign led by a strong, energetic, spiritual pastor. No ism will be able to stand, much less to flourish in the path of such a church.

But enough has been said. Let us come back to our challenge. And what a challenge it is! This world is not yet made but is in the making. What are you going to do with your life—you lawyer, you doctor, you teacher, you preacher, ye men and women of whatever name or calling? Sometime ago a layman from New York City told a story of one little street car drawn by mules. They keep this one going in order to maintain the franchise. The driver had been in the habit of turning in a few dimes at the end of each day. One night he turned in between twenty and thirty dollars. The superintendent looked up at him in amazement and said: "How did you do it?" The young man looked into the face of his superior officer, and said: "Hitherto I have been confining myself to my little side street. Today I swung out into the Broadway." Brothers and sisters, I call on you to join hands with God in carrying out His eternal plan. Link your personality and your calling to God's Broadway.

The great poet has assured us that "God's in his heaven, all's well with the world." I would remind you that God is still in his world, and therefore we can face any obstacle, declaring with the splendid optimism of faith, "We can do all things in him that strengtheneth us."

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of
wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of his terrible swift
sword.

His truth is marching on.

He hath sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call
retreat;
He is sifting out the hearts of men before his judgment
seat;
O be swift, my soul, to answer him! Be jubilant my feet!
Our God is marching on."

BOOK REVIEWS

I. BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The Jews among the Greeks and Romans. By Max Radin. The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1915. 421 pp.

Dr. Max Radin of New York, has written a very able discussion of the checkered history of his people during the centuries when they come in vital contact with Greek and Roman Civilization. He is a close student and loves Greece and Rome and writes frankly as a Jewish scholar to interpret the life of the Jews to the modern world.

Like Josephus, the author is conciliatory and scholarly and his book is more than worth while to the earnest student of Christian origins. He makes copious references to the sources in notes at the close of the volume which will show the student how to pursue his studies further. It is a good thing for Jews and Christians to try to understand one another. A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources. By James Hope Moulton, D.D., and George Milligan, D.D. Part II *βάαλ* to *δωροφορία* Hodder and Stoughton (Geo. H. Doran), New York and London, 1915. 177 pp. 5s. net.

The war is evidently delaying the publication of these valuable notes on New Testament words. One is gratified to see the appearance of Part II. The preacher will find here rich illustrations for the fascinating study of the language of the Greek New Testament. We shall probably have to wait a very long time for the publication of Deissmann's new lexicon and meanwhile this Vocabulary is absolutely necessary if one wishes to bring his Thayer up to date with modern knowledge. Souter's Pocket Lexicon is too small to take the place of Thayer. One is compelled still to use Thayer. A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Historical Jesus. By the Rev. T. J. Thorburn, D.D. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, England, 1915. 79 pp., sixpence net.

The author is well-known by his books, "Jesus the Christ: Historical or Mythical" and "Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism." He is an able defender of the Christian doctrines and in the present booklet presents in clear and convincing style the facts concerning the evidence of the history and life of Jesus from non-Scriptural sources. The statement is wholly satisfactory and conclusive to an unprejudiced mind and fully answers the myth theory of Arthur Drews and W. B. Smith. The enemies of the Cross are never satisfied and are forever seeking to destroy the power of Christ over the hearts of men.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Portraiture of Jesus in the Gospels. By Albert L. Vail. Fleming H. Revell Company. 157 pp. 75 cents.

It is refreshing even to turn the pages of this book. After a prolonged diet of the "Synoptic Problem," in which immensely more cob than corn has been offered, it gives a sense of relief to read an author who deals with the Gospels as so many individual works by authors, each with a purpose and manner of his own, a fact which remains a fact even if it has been pretty much overlooked of late. The aim of Mr. Vail is to set forth the peculiar presentation of Jesus by each evangelist in turn, and this intent is carried with such a wealth of detail, intelligence and sympathy as to make this little book a real contribution to the study of the Gospels and a useful complement to much of the criticism of the day which is too busy training the roots of the Gospels to stop and taste their fruits. The reviewer lays down the book with only one regret, and that is that Mr. Vail did not, in addition to what he has so helpfully done, attempt also to combine the various elements which he has remarked into a simple composite portrait of Jesus. It might have helped many to have his conception of Jesus as he was among men.

It would take too much space to sample fairly the methods and results of the author. But a few sentences, though merely "obiter dicta," deserve quotation and attention. Mr. Vail says (p. 12): "To use the same elocution in reading an oration of Daniel Webster and a hymn of Frances Havergal is to botch one or both of them. The same is true when we substitute for these names the names Mark and John. Probably the average preacher fails in nothing more than in reading the Bible as the leader of an assembly. He needs as thorough training in elocution for reading the Bible as for preaching the sermon, or for the whole range of homiletics, unless his own words are of more importance to his hearers than the words of God are."

DAVID FOSTER ESTES.

The Gospel According to Saint Mark, with Introduction and Notes. Edited by the Ven. W. C. Allen, M.A., Archdeacon of Manchester, and Principal of Egerton Hall, Manchester; Formerly Chaplain-Fellow and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew of Exeter College, Oxford. New York, 1915. The Macmillan Company. xvi+208 pp. and map. \$2.00 net.

To begin with, one finds here a very desirable commentary. Its Introduction, while not elaborate, is learned and critical and maintains with calm assurance the conservative view. It is a commentary dealing with external, critical questions rather than with the life and spirit of the Gospel. Much attention is, therefore, given to details of text, construction, etc. While stoutly maintaining the ecumenical ideal of Jesus and therefore initially repudiating all prejudice against supernaturalism the work does not adhere with firmness to this principle in detail. The note about the *evil spirits and the swine* in connection with the *Gadarene demoniac*, rejecting the reality of the spirits is ludicrously absurd. But, such points aside, the work is one of fine scholarship and very useful, indeed, for critical study.

W. O. CARVER.

The Mysticism of St. John's Gospel. The Hulsean Lectures for 1915-1916. By Herbert A. Watson, D.D. Robert Scott, Paternoster Row, London. 1916. 186 pp. 3s. 6d. net.

The lectures are four. The first discusses the meaning of Mysticism (Greek, Jewish, Christian). The second treats the Revelation of the Nature of God with a careful balancing of the various aspects of the Incarnation in the New Testament writers. The third deals with the Symbolism of the Incarnation with reference to our Lord's Personality. The fourth makes the Practical Application of the Incarnation as seen in modern Pietism and other developments. One notes at once that the lectures deal fundamentally with mysticism and only incidentally with the Fourth Gospel as one expression of it. But this psychological and philosophical approach to the Fourth Gospel has its value and the author is loyal to Jesus as the Revelation of God and the Saviour from sin.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Acts. By B. H. Carroll, D.D., LL.D., Late President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Edited by J. B. Cranfill, LL.D. New York, 1916, Fleming H. Revell Company. viii+471 pp. \$2.00 net.

Dr. Cranfill as editor and patron is pushing forward Dr. Carroll's Interpretation of the English Bible with enthusiasm. It is a work with many notable marks of excellence and strength. The Editor's method of seeking to reproduce the author's exact language and the exact lists of class-room questions gives the work, no doubt, added value and charm to Dr. Carroll's students and to those who had heard him lecture and preach often enough for his style to be part of the power of his thought. But these things tend to colloquialize the work and in the long run will limit its usefulness. The Editor is quite capable of using the editorial function to the ultimate advantage of the work. Particularly could some faulty expressions, altogether permissible in the familiarity of the class-room, have been modified to the distinct advantage of the readers. One feels that the beautiful, reverent loyalty of the Editor to Dr. Carroll has misled him in such matters. Coming to this particular volume, its positions are, of course, vigorously orthodox and wherever there is occasion for controversy, as *e. g.* at Acts 2:38, or again on questions

as to Paul's experience, the offending views are smashed with the powerful blows of the masterful contender. Radical Higher Criticism gets many a well-deserved blow.

The interpretations are, for the most part, correct, always clear, and are so given as to help the teacher or preacher directly and extensively. It ought, perhaps, to be said that these commentaries are all prepared with the preacher and his use of them distinctly in mind. But this fact must not be taken to suggest that the lay reader will not find them highly profitable. They will always be within his comprehension and will stimulate and embolden his faith.

The different parts of the Acts are not expounded with corresponding completeness and at many points one longs for more.

Dr. Carroll caught with clear insight Luke's idea and plan in writing Acts and so he expounds him with sympathy.

One cannot at all points accept the commentator's positions. For example, in the fine interpretation of Pentecost it is unfortunate that no direct answer is found to Dr. Carroll's own question as to just what the "gift of the Holy Spirit" consists in and what was its purpose. The phrase "even to as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him," (2:39), is taken by Dr. Carroll as limiting the promise among believers to selected ones, presumably few. This seems to be in direct conflict with Peter's idea. It is curious to find Dr. Carroll concluding that the one serious defect with the immersion of the twelve in Acts 19 was an improper administrator. An improper administrator they seem sure enough to have had, but that does not at all appear to be the point of Paul's objection. Here, as at some other places, the passages to be interpreted and the interpretations given are too much under the influence of local and temporary controversies. But when it comes to great general ideas of the Kingdom and of the Gospel the comments reflect true insight and mighty grip on the great things of God and of Christ Jesus.

W. O. CARVER.

The Acts of the Apostles. By William Owen Carver, Th.D., LL.D., Associate Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament and Pro-

fessor of Comparative Religion and Missions in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Nashville, Tenn., 1916, Sunday School Board Southern Baptist Convention. Volume in "The Convention Series." I. J. Van Ness, D.D., General Editor. 270 pp. 75 cents, postpaid.

Our Sunday School Board at Nashville is rendering many valuable services to the denomination in the South and throughout the world. Not the least of these services is the series of handy commentaries on the different books of the Bible that it is sending out. The latest one of these commentaries is the volume on the book of Acts. Dr. Carver is thoroughly at home in the broad field of religious literature and of course is at home in any part of the Bible. But if any book in the Bible appeals to him more than another one would think that this book would naturally be the book of Acts. On reading this last volume from his pen this general surmise is thoroughly sustained.

The general point of view from which this commentary is written may be gathered from a sentence or two from the author's introduction. He says, "It was not to tell the story of men, not even of apostles, that Luke wrote, not even of Peter, the great leader, nor of Paul, the mighty herald and teacher. He would rather show how the Holy Spirit carried forward the work Jesus began. In this work men are agents, but the Spirit is the Power and the Mind. Luke selects for record those 'acts' which reveal and illustrate the plan and method of the Holy Spirit." This point of view is maintained throughout the volume, and when one comes to the last page and reads Dr. Carver's "Resume of the Gospel of the Holy Spirit," he is made to hope that this gifted and devout student of the word and work of God may see his way one of these days to give to the world a fuller unfolding of the points named in this one page of outline resume.

The general analysis of the book of Acts followed in this commentary is the most simple and natural possible. It is simply that laid down by Luke himself in 1:8. "In the commission at the ascension, which is recorded only in Acts (1:6-8)," a geographical plan is given and this the key to the logical analysis

of the book. The missionaries were to witness (1) "in Jerusalem"; (2) "in all Judea and Samaria"; (3) "into the uttermost part of the earth."

The remaining pages of the book are taken up with a faithful unfolding of these three lines of progress as the Holy Spirit carries them on through the men and women who have become "mete for the Master's use."

The book is arranged in convenient form, the text being at the top of the page and the comment and exposition on the lower part of the page. In this way it is easy to keep the eye in close touch with both the text and the comment. This is not a commentary that one will wish to put on the shelf to refer to for light on a specific verse on special occasions—though it will yield help for this kind of use. It is rather a book that one will wish to read right through that he may get a vivid and comprehensive view of the Spirit's work in the early days of the Church. Besides this, there are many gems of suggestion which ought to form life concepts for the Christian student and worker. For example, on the first page of the comments I find the following: "In his flesh and in the Holy Spirit the work of Jesus includes *doing* and *teaching*. The doing is first and is interpreted by the teaching which in turn puts others to doing. When true, Christianity always has these two elements, deed and creed, active energy and propagating faith." A most interesting and instructive comparison is made on p. 23f between the advent of Jesus into the world and the advent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. One would love to copy two pages here, but a sentence or two will have to suffice: "As we linger with reverent love about the manger in Bethlehem, so we should draw near to Pentecost and learn its meaning. God and man became perfectly united in Jesus of Nazareth that God and man might become organically united in the church, which is Christ's mystical and historical body, the institution and organism in which by the Holy Spirit God lives in the social life of the world."

It hardly need be said that the point of view of this book is that of the Baptists, though it is in no sense a sectarian book. Dr. Carver has followed closely the best Greek text and often ren-

ders a passage with an abruptness that might not please some people. His purpose evidently is to arrest attention and try to bring people as nearly as possible to hear the voice of the Spirit of God.

The price of the book is very low. It has come from the press at a very opportune time when we are studying the book of Acts in the International Sunday School lessons. Those who are wise will take the hint; those who are otherwise will miss a treasure that is worth while.

What an inspiration it is to read such a book as this and then to reflect that every true believer and humble worker for the Lord is in the best sense in direct line of apostolic succession.

The last sentence of comment is this: "This 'Gospel of the Holy Spirit' came to its end here, but went forth as a gospel from then till the end of time, from there to the ends of the earth." Who is not grateful that he can still have a part in carrying on to completion what God has so well begun in Jesus, in the Holy Spirit, and in those who have labored in the Lord through the centuries? "Other men have labored and ye are entered into their labors."

Wake Forest, N. C.

W. R. CULLOM.

II. CHURCH HISTORY.

The Works of John Smyth, Fellow of Christ's College, 1594-8. Tercentenary Edition for the Baptist Historical Society, with notes and Biography by W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., F. R. Hist. S., Sometime Exhibitioner of King's College. Cambridge University Press, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1915. Two vols. \$10.00.

More and more we are learning that John Smyth, the "Se-Baptist" as Dexter called him, was one of the ablest and most important characters in the history of early English non-conformity. Dexter was the first to give us any very clear and definite view of the man; his presentation was being filled out and made clearer by Shakespeare, Burgess and Burrage. Dr. Whitley has now put the capstone on recent investigation by giving this edition of his works. It is the most important con-

tribution which has ever been made to the life of Smyth. Dr. Whitley's intensive study of the history of English Baptists and his position as secretary of the Baptist Historical Society fitted him in a peculiar degree to perform this side of his task. Moreover his knowledge of the general religious history of England and of Cambridge University at this period has enabled him to produce a remarkably clear and helpful background.

The biographical portion covers 106 pages of the first volume. In this Dr. Whitley has filled out the meager facts of Smyth's life with much interesting history of his times and environment, and has shown the probabilities of Smyth's life in a most interesting and helpful way. The detailed history of the university life of that time will doubtless have more interest for English than for most American readers. Certain it is that Dr. Whitley has given us, in a clear and attractive form, all that can now be known of Smyth. Further investigation will probably not yield much more of value.

But the most valuable part of the work for the historian as well as for the general reader is the reproduction of Smyth's works. Few copies, very few, of Smyth's works have been preserved, and are quite inaccessible to American scholars. The work of reproduction has evidently been carefully done,—form, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc., being preserved as in the original. This volume thus brings to the hands of the scholar and general reader alike the works of the first scholarly representative of the English Baptist movement.

It is true that he was an Arminian or Pelagian and was not followed in his theological views of human nature by the majority of later Baptists. It is also true that he became dissatisfied with his action and sought membership among the Mennonites. Notwithstanding these facts he was a figure of first importance in the history of non-conformity and of the English Baptists in particular.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Early Methodists under Persecution. By Josiah Henry Barr. The Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1916. 256 pp. \$1.25.

The author of this work has diligently searched Methodist literature for cases of persecution directed against the early

Methodists. Cases were not difficult to discover, because the early Methodists suffered from mob violence, misrepresentation and contempt as few others of the eighteenth century. They bore their heckling bravely and in good spirit and often used it to good account in the advertisement and propagation of their own cause.

The author does not seem to have used the original sources extensively, but there are constant references to the best lives of the Wesleys and other early Methodist leaders.

The story of Methodist faithfulness under the brutal treatment which was accorded them, not unfrequently with the connivance of the authorities, is an inspiring one. It is a treasure of Christian endurance under suffering not only for the Methodists but for all Christians. With gratitude to the Giver we recognize that the possibility of such treatment is gone today among Anglo-Saxons, but we should also remember that such persecution is still suffered in some countries.

The book is a good one for all of us to read.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches.
A Mission Study Manual on the Reformation. By Rev. Prof. James I. Good, D.D., LL.D. Heidelberg Press, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.

This little book of 160 pages is an admirable study of the leading reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian churches of the sixteenth century. As is indicated in the sub-title it is intended as a manual for young people and for this purpose it is well adapted. The paper, printing and illustrations are attractive, the text is clear, concise and interesting, the historic perspective is well preserved. Such a book will be a great blessing to young people when they are led by a competent teacher. Especially will the Presbyterian and Reformed young get great inspiration out of it in the study of the lives and struggles and sufferings of their own great leaders. The book can be commended without qualification for the purposes for which it was written.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Baptist Principles and Practices. A Series of Sunday Morning Services. By M. E. Dodd, D.D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Shreveport, La. The Chronicle Pub. Co., Alexandria, La. 125 pp. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 10 cents.

In this series of eight sermons Dr. Dodd did what it would probably be well for many other pastors to do—he instructed his own people and such others as cared to hear him in the most important and distinctive of Baptist principles and practices. He treated such themes as “Baptists and the Bible,” “Religious and Political Liberty,” “Individualism in Religion,” “Baptism of Jesus,” etc., all of them of vast importance. His treatment is clear, vigorous, attractive and kindly. No reasonable non-Baptist hearer could have been offended, while he would certainly have been enlightened and impressed. Dr. Dodd has appealed to Scripture and history and the published opinions of eminent scholars of communions other than ours, and has found the Baptist position solidly supported at every point. These sermons must have been interesting and helpful to his hearers, and the perusal of the volume will do good.

It is marred somewhat by bad proof-reading. For example, we find Dr. Mullins’ name with an (e) in several places, very often Christian is without the capital, and there are other blunders which were not corrected.

There are a few minor mistakes as to fact. The implication on p. 12f that John Wycliffe was martyred is a mistake; his ashes (his bones were burned forty-four years after his death) were strewn on the Severn not the Avon. On page 19, Whitman should be Wightman. There seems to be unwarranted exaggeration at some points, as when it is stated, p. 13, that our Sunday School Board is “sending out millions of Bibles,” and on p. 65, when it is said that “Our Baptist forefathers . . . have actually run rivers of blood at the hands of persecutors.”

It would also seem that it would have conduced to clearness if Bro. Dodd had distinguished between Anabaptists and Mennonites and Baptists. He calls them all Baptists and yet he would not accept into the fellowship of his church or at the Lord’s table any Anabaptist or Mennonite without rebaptism. In view

of that fact it looks a trifle inconsistent to call them Baptists without explanation. This is even more true of Wycliffe who was, he says, "in all essentials a Baptist." Wycliffe never left the Catholic church and was in attendance on a mass at the parish church of Gutterworth when he was stricken. It is true that he had adopted evangelical doctrines, but he was a good way from Baptist views and practices, as I understand them.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

III. THEOLOGY, APOLOGETICS AND MISSIONS.

Evolution and Spiritual Life. By Stewart A. McDonald, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Chaplain and Assistant Master at Winchester College. Author of *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1915; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, xxvi+--303 pp. \$2.50.

The author of this work is a spiritual evolutionist and a thinker of originality and independence. He belongs to the Bergson type, but is not in any dependent way a pupil of the French philosopher. He applies what is essentially the principle of the *Creative Evolution* to the problems of religion, as Bergson has not as yet himself done; and in so applying the principle he of necessity presses it further in its interpretation of being. It is a fundamental fault in philosophy first to work out a principle of being independently of religion and then later to seek to apply the principle in the realm of religion, for religion is a prime factor among the facts which philosophy is supposed to explain. It cannot properly be left for corollary dealing. That is what Bergson has done, what Eucken did and Royce. McDowell does not aspire yet to the dignity of originator of a system but his method takes for its starting point the essential issues of the problem.

And in dealing with religion our author goes to the very basal difficulties. He undertakes to account for the antinomies of thought out of which have grown conflicting philosophies. He faces the difficulties of finite being existing in the comprehensive infinite; of the many existing in the One. His real contribution

—and it is a genuine contribution—lies in his suggestive treatment of transcendence and immanence both in God and in men. Along this line he deals with the matters of freedom and immortality and seeks a secure basis for perfect personality at once sharing the infinite life and maintaining self-identity.

Having dealt with the scientific and philosophical aspects of his subject the author proceeds to what he calls "Application," wherein he deals with "Prayer," "Sacraments," "Faith, Providence and Revelation," and "The Christian Community." It is in this second Part that the work grows relatively weak and for the same reason that Von Hügel is weak in similar topics in his very able "Eternal Life," which is close akin to this work of McDowell and which is quoted frequently by the latter. Both are bound by the dogmas of the creeds. In their philosophy both are free because working in a field uncharted and unfenced by the councils of the Church. In the sphere of the Church's definition both grow timid and constrained.

McDowell's discussions of prayer are brief but illuminating and helpful. So on other topics in this field save in the matter of "sacraments." Here he is slavishly cautious to support the claims of the creeds while he largely ignores the teaching of the Scriptures. In the matter of baptism especially he seems to have only the remotest idea of Apostolic teaching of its purpose.

The work is one of great ability and suggestiveness to such as care for metaphysical reading that is remarkably lucid and frank.

W. O. CARVER.

William Newton Clarke. *A Biography with Additional Sketches by his Friends and Colleagues.* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1916.

We find nowhere a definite announcement of the name of the writer of this biography of Dr. Clarke. But there is abundant evidence that it has been prepared by his wife. The outward events of Dr. Clarke's life possess little of historical or dramatic interest from the ordinary point of view. It was a stream which flowed with singular smoothness from its source to its mouth

where it blended with the waters of the great sea of eternity. This is really the biography of spiritual life, of one whose interests were predominantly those of the soul's progress in higher things.

Dr. Clarke first became widely known through his work on *Systematic Theology*. He made theology a fascinating study. His style was singularly clear and simple. He was little concerned for the technicalities of his subject. His aim was to interpret to the average Christian as well as the thinker and scholar the meaning of Christian experience. He spoke to the heart as well as the intellect. Men might differ from him in his doctrinal views, but they delighted to read what he wrote in his numerous books. The author takes us through the earlier years of pastoral experience at Newton Centre, Montreal, and elsewhere, and shows us the studious habits and profoundly earnest ministry of Dr. Clarke. She also makes clear the relation of these experiences to his life as a teacher which followed.

The sketches in the second part of the volume written by friends and admirers are a valuable addition to the volume. Few teachers have been more beloved by their pupils than was Dr. Clarke. He was not only an interesting and stimulating teacher, but also a winsome personality. Men might differ with him in his theological views, but they never failed to admire his Christian character.

In theology Dr. Clarke was a mediator between the extreme conservatives and the extreme liberals of our time. He was quite "advanced" from the point of view of some and rather "conservative" from that of others. The present writer thinks there were points at which he conceded too much to the radical criticism of the day and that there are some weak points in his doctrinal views. But he did a great work in simplifying theology and helping many struggling minds out into the true freedom in Christ.

E. Y. MULLINS.

Ancestral Voices. By John A. Hutton, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton, New York, 1916. 263 pp. \$1.50 net.

Dr. Hutton has always interested and inspired me, but never until in this volume impressed me as being exceptionally learned or gifted with remarkable insight. The present volume discloses a distinct gift for religious and social philosophy and shrewdness in the noblest type of apologetic.

He writes all the while against the background consciousness of the cataclysmic European war, and at several places distinctly seeks to indicate the proper interpretation of that war.

It is for him a religious war—and he maintains that only for religion are men justified in fighting. He states with rare keenness, what has been apprehended by many—that in the present conflict the Christian interpretation of life and of the world are struggling for control of human ideals and progress against a distinctly antagonistic conception.

Dr. Hutton holds “that we are beholding, in these troubled times, a conflict between these ‘Ancestral Voices of the Soul’ and the merely rationalistic and temporal way of conceiving man’s true function in this world.” The freedom of man’s deeper ideals is at stake.

The discussion is not by any means narrowly limited to the present crisis. The principles are discussed in the light of history, and especially as illustrated in great literature.

A great feature for praise in the book is the remarkably able way in which it deals with the sense of sin.

The sympathetic interpretations of Nietzsche, the Tractarians and Chesterton are most engaging and helpful—none the less so that I am unable to accept all his positions and statements. Particularly do I not accept his view of Nietzsche. To undertake to find a *system* of philosophy to be rationally accounted for in the ravings of that moral madman, and especially to seek to interpret him as a prophet is to my thinking more generous than the truth will allow.

We have here a fine book. Dr. Hutton had done well not so continuously to be referring to his lack of time and in general to be displaying an apologetic attitude of haste. But it is far and away the best work he has done. It is a very desirable volume.

W. O. CARVER.

Paradoxical Pain. By Robert Maxwell Harbin, A.B., M.D., F.A.C.S., Author of *Health and Happiness*, etc. Boston, 1916, Sherman, French and Company, xiv-|-212 pp. \$1.25 net.

This volume is packed with wisdom founded on wide information. The author, a physician, is a scientist in the physical sphere who has not lost his bearings nor forgotten that the physical is but sphere and atmosphere for the ethical and spiritual. He apprehends that evolution in the physical realm does not at all imply similar evolution in the psychic sphere; and experience shows that this similar evolution is not to be found. The age of great advance in knowledge of things has not added to the wisdom of interpreting things in relation to life. "Knowledge has stuffed us, while we have been starved for wisdom."

It is very important that we learn the true nature and way of happiness. Part of this learning consists in the right interpretation of pain. There are two sorts, pain that promotes good ends and pain which hinders and destroys. The latter alone is evil. The work proceeds, through thirty-three short chapters to discuss various sorts of pain and their uses. The work is one to be studied and the study of which will illuminate the mind, steady the heart troubled over so much of pain in life and summon the soul to seek the highest and noblest ends by means of all the experiences that belong to one's growing life and the growing life of the race. Truly it is a good book.

W. O. CARVER.

Men and World Service. Addresses delivered at the National Missionary Congress, Washington, D. C., April 26-30, 1916. A Survey of Achievement; A Council of War; A Summons to Advance. Laymen's Missionary Movement, New York, 1916. v-|-350 pp.

If one wants to know, and to feel, the power of the current awakening of lay interest in the Kingdom of our Lord he will get it best from this volume. If one wants to know the actual facts about the significance of the Laymen's Movement let him read and ponder this volume. If one wants some of the greatest Missionary addresses he will find them here. One finds still here

rather too great a number of ministers, secretaries and, so-to-say professional missionary laymen; and would wish that more sincere, pure, everyday laymen had been called on to speak to us. Thus the Convention and its report would appear less a call to move and more the expression of an actual movement.

The greatest advance of the Kingdom is awaiting a general laymen's movement. Once get that and the conquest of the world is begun in earnest. Every pastor ought to get this volume for himself and get it into the hands of his laymen.

W. O. CARVER.

Christian Certainties of Belief: The Christ, the Bible, Salvation, Immortality. By Julian K. Smyth, Author of "Footprints of the Saviour," "Holy Names," "Religion and Life," "The Heart of the War," etc. New York, The New-Church Press. xi-|-123 pp.

This little volume is an ideal of propaganda for the Swedenborgian Church. It seeks to identify essential Christianity with the fundamental teachings of the "New-church" cult and to defend the common essentials in a day of doubt and questioning. Now that type of apologetic is the best type and this work is well done. While the reviewer cannot accept all that is implied, nor quite all that is said, he can see the merits and value of the method and can praise the skill with which the plan is executed. A discriminating reader can use it advantageously; an unskilled reader may imperceptibly be led into admiration for one-sided views of basal truths.

The Holiness of Paschal. By H. F. Stewart, B.D., Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge. The Hulsean Lecture, 1914-15. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1915. 150 pp. 4s. net.

This volume, the Hulsean Lectures, 1914-'15, is a most scholarly discussion of the characteristics, the controversies, the theology and the religion of Blaise Paschal. It is based on careful, painstaking and incisive study of Paschal's Letters, the Thoughts and other writings; and takes account of all the Paschal literature. Extensive, detailed reference notes are made taking the reader back to the sources. Any student of Paschal will find this volume of the highest order.

IV. SOCIOLOGICAL AND GENERAL.

Nationality in Modern History. By J. Holland Rose, Litt. D. Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, etc. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1916. \$1.25 net.

The present situation in Europe, which inspired this work, is evidence of its timeliness. And the author discusses the topic in a more judicial spirit than might have been expected under the circumstances. There are not wanting indications of his anti-German feeling; but it does not influence the discussion enough to detract very seriously from its scientific value.

In attempting to define and account for the peculiar group-consciousness which is called nationality, the author pursues, first, the method of exclusion; and finds that it is not due to racial unity nor to common language nor to a common religion,—though each of these is a strong tie. In this negative part of his argument he is clear and convincing. He does not seem to be quite so clear or convincing when he undertakes to define positively and to account for national feeling. He speaks of it as an instinct; but is evidently wrong in that, since the present national groupings originated in comparatively recent times. Again he refers it to community of "culture," but are not language and religion essential and important elements of a people's "culture"? He is nearer the truth when he finds its historic genesis, in part, in the long opposition of political groups which originated in what may be termed the accidents of history.

But if the author's definition and explanation of this great fact of national feeling are not altogether satisfactory, it should be said that he has made in this book a notable contribution to the better comprehension of one of the most important facts of present day life—and one that challenges most serious thought.

C. S. GARDNER.

Rest Days—A Study in Early Law and Morality. By Hatton Webster, Ph.D., Professor of Social Anthropology in the University of Nebraska. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916 325 pp. \$3.00 net.

The theory of this book is that "rest days" have their origin in the *taboos* of primitive society. The *taboo* is an outgrowth of the primitive man's way of thinking. Some things come to be potent for weal or woe in the life of man; they are felt to be mysterious, abnormal, uncanny, awful. "Primitive psychology, refining these ideas and applying them to different classes of phenomena, produces the cognate notions of pollution and sanctity. * * * These characteristics are easily regarded as infections, capable of transmission, not alone by contact, but also by sight and mere proximity." Hence arise certain prohibitions of human conduct with reference to these things—*taboos*.

All the socially recognized and enjoined "rest days" are accounted for by our author as having such an origin. Among these he includes the Jewish Sabbath, which he supposes was at first connected with the changing phases of the moon, and was only gradually detached from the lunar periods.

In all backward societies the number of those tabooed days—on which work is forbidden—is very great, so great as to constitute a serious check upon economic and social development. The author, however, recognizes the great social value of the Jewish and Christian Sabbath. Gradually the mysterious and awful associations which gather around these days die away. They become "secularized," and the useless ones are eliminated.

Such, in brief outline, is the theory. Whatever one may think of it, Prof. Webster has adduced a great wealth of material in its support; and in this respect, if in no other, the book is valuable.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Social Ideals of the Lord's Prayer. By Perry J. Stackhouse, Pastor Tabernacle Baptist Church, Utica, New York. Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1916. 167 pp.

A healthful book. Out of this wonderful Prayer which Jesus taught his disciples the author draws the "social Gospel" in its fullness, and does it in a convincing way. After some critical matters are disposed of—such as the two forms of the prayer given in Luke and Matthew, and the questions as to the scope

and originality of the prayer—the divine fatherhood, the human sonship and brotherhood, the Kingdom and its principles of love, service and sacrifice are discussed. Then follow discussions of “the cry for bread,” “the ideal of forgiveness” and “social responsibility.” The last chapter is entitled “The World Set Free,” an application of the last petition in the prayer—“deliver us from the evil.”

After reading this intensely earnest presentation of the large meaning of the “Lord’s Prayer,” one wonders how these words could have been so often on the lips of the followers of Jesus without a clearer apprehension of that meaning.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites. By Henry Schaeffer, Ph.D., Member of the American School for Oriental Study and Research, Syria, 1908-9. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915. 245 pp.

The book is an elaboration of a Doctor’s thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania. The author “does not pretend to great originality in the views set forth,” but nevertheless he has made a valuable contribution to the study of this interesting theme, in giving us in succinct form a statement of the results of modern research into the most important phases of the legislation of the early Hebrews, Babylonians and Arabs. The title, however, is more comprehensive than the contents of the book, since it was obviously impossible within the limits of this volume to discuss all the early legislation of these branches of the Semitic race, and much of what is treated is discussed too briefly. But notwithstanding this, the author will help his readers to a clearer view of the social life and social problems of the people of whom he writes. His discussion of the land problem and its relation to the family and clan is especially valuable.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Photoplay: A Psychological Study. By Hugo Münsterberg. D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1916. 233 pp.

That "the moving pictures bring us an independent art, controlled by esthetic laws of its own, working with mental appeals which are fundamentally different from those of the theater, with a sphere of its own and ideals of its own," is the contention of this book. The author makes an extremely interesting and convincing study of the psychology of the photoplay, in the first part, discussing it from the point of view of perception, attention, memory, imagination and emotion. "The photoplay tells us the human story by overcoming the forms of the outer world, and by adjusting the events to the forms of the inner world, namely attention, memory, imagination, emotion." This thesis has been worked out in detail in a really surprising way.

In part two, the author discusses the esthetics of the photoplay and is quite successful in demonstrating that it is a real and independent art, not a cheap imitation of the theater. The chapter on "The Purpose of Art" is a singularly clear statement of the theory of esthetics now generally held by psychologists. The art of the photoplay, the author rightly maintains, is yet in the crude state of its development, and his great possibilities.

In the last chapter on "The Function of the Photoplay" there is a frank recognition of the possibilities of evil as well as the possibilities of good in the "movies"; and the vast and growing social significance of the new art is emphasized.

Everybody interested in anyway whatsoever in this subject should read this book without fail.

C. S. GARDNER.

The Negro Year Book: An Annual Encyclopaedia of the Negro, 1916-1917. Monroe N. Work, In charge of Division of Records and Research, Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, Editor. The Negro Year Book Publishing Company, Tuskegee, Ala., 1916. 470 pp. Paper, 35 cents, postpaid.

This is the fourth annual edition of this Year Book. In everything save the quality of paper used in it, it is a thoroughly creditable, even praiseworthy, production, and at the price at which it is sold the material cannot be complained of. And one cannot but be glad that it is so published as to place it within

reach of all readers. Its range of information is so complete that one will find answers here to most pertinent inquiries touching the history, present condition and achievements of American Negroes.

There are articles, tables of statistics, biographical notes, lists of schools and all sorts of educational and religious data, accounts of Negroes' efforts in all lines of life-work and culture. It would be well for all concerned if this Year Book could be very widely consulted and studied by whites and blacks.

W. O. CARVER.

The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. By George Earle Buckle, in succession to W. F. Monypenny. Vol. IV, 1855-1868, with Portraits and Illustrations. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1916. 610 pp. \$3.00.

Volume III of this work was reviewed in these columns in 1915. The qualities that characterize that volume and which were then set forth have been carried over into this. The work is full not only on the personal life of its subject, but upon the history of England and the times. There have been few better studies of this period in English history. One of the great advantages of biography when well written is that it shows history in the making and therefore much more like it appears to contemporaries than other forms of history are usually able to present. This work is particularly strong in this direction. One can read this volume and get a most interesting view of English history as a whole in this period.

The work reproduces many of Disraeli's letters and state papers and thus gives an intimate personal touch to the narrative. This period is a very important one in English and world history in general and this volume constitutes an important contribution to the history of the period.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Daddy Gander Rhymes for Little Children. By Maude McGehee Hawkins, Illustrations by Walker; Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1916. 96 pp. 50 cts. net.

Old Mother Goose said :
 "Daddy Gander, now go
And write some more rhymes
 For the children to know."

They gave him a pencil,
 They gave him a table,
And there he wrote down
 Everything he was able.

And to tell the truth, he made a fairsome job of it. He has not made Mother Goose obsolete, nor obsolescent. He has made some good rhymes that amuse the children. Several of them aim at more of sense than Mother Goose sought and they do not usually gain thereby. Some are quite tame. The book as a whole is a valuable addition to the library for children.

American Baptist Year Book, 1916. Rev. Charles A. Walker, Philadelphia, Editor. Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society. Paper, 50 cents net.

This work of 300 pp. is in the established and well-known form of this annual. It is filled with statistics, lists of ministers, of schools, periodicals, etc., and has lists of all general and state Baptist organizations with officers, locations, etc.

The change in editorship made necessary by the death of Dr. J. G. Walker has made no change in the plan of the book. Dr. Walker had edited it during two periods, in all thirty years.

Il "Padrenostro" e Il Mondo Moderno. By Pietro Chiminelli. Scuola Teologica Battista, Roma, 1916.

This little volume is the seventh in a series of publications, gotten out by our Baptist Theological School, at Rome. The others have dealt with theological and homiletical subjects. This one is devotional. It is a study of the Lord's Prayer as appropriate to the modern situation. It is a pleasing thing that the author should dedicate the book to his beloved teacher, Dr. Whit-

tinghill. Like the other books of the series, the work is well gotten up as to print and paper. It is illustrated in an interesting way by the facile pencil of Paul Paschetto, a brilliant young Baptist.

The introduction deals with critical matters concerning the Lord's Prayer. The point of view is modern, yet conservative and reverent. The author feelingly refers to the spirit of prayer which has increased among the European peoples during the horrors of the great war. He mentions that the French general, Foch, after his great victory at the Marne, said, "It is not I who ought to be thanked, but He who is above, and who alone gives the victory."

In the body of the work the author discusses each request of the great prayer. He does this in an interesting and able manner. The study of the original words is apparent. The author refers to a considerable literature on the subject. The spirit which he brings to his work is devout. Upon the whole, it is a thoughtful treatise, and must do much to those among whom it should be circulated. It is to be hoped that this fresh and encouraging study of the great prayer of Jesus will find many appreciative readers, especially in Italy.

E. C. DARGAN.

A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament. By Alexander Souter, M.A., D.Litt., Sometime Yates Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in Mansfield College and now Professor of Humanity (Latin) in the University of Aberdeen. 1916: The Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York. 290 pp. 75 cents net.

I have known for sometime that Dr. Souter was at work on this project and I greatly rejoice at its consummation. Here at last the student has in handy and convenient form a New Testament lexicon that gives the modern knowledge from the papyri and the inscriptions. It is known that Deissmann is at work (or was, alas, before the dreadful war) on a lexicon to take the place of Thayer-Grimm. Moulton and Milligan are publishing in installments their useful Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources,

but this brilliant piece of work the rather furnishes material for a lexicon such as that of Deissmann and is very helpful for the real student. Bagster's Analytical Lexicon of New Testament Greek is helpful for beginners who do not find the forms readily. The present work of Dr. Souter, well-known to New Testament students by his *Novum Testamentum Graece* and his *Text and Canon of the New Testament* is the first lexicon of the new type that must come. It is very brief, but accurate and reliable except in one word where I regret to see a lapse from pure scholarship in a sort of sop to the ecclesiastical Cerberus. The word βαπτίζω is defined thus: "lit. I dip, submerge, but specifically of ceremonial dipping (whether immersion or affusion) I baptize." Certainly modern ecclesiastical usage employs the word "baptize" in the ceremonial sense with no regard to its etymology, but it is pure begging of the question to read this modern usage back into the New Testament idiom. One had hoped that this custom had disappeared from New Testament Greek lexicons. No other modern lexicon gives anything but dip or immerse. "Ceremonial dipping" it utterly modern and not in the New Testament. But barring this lapse, I heartily recommend Dr. Souter's Pocket Lexicon.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Die Tägliche Vergebung der Sünden, von Ludwig Ihmels, Professor der Theologie zu Leipzig. Second, improved and enlarged, edition, 1916. Dorffling & Franke, Leipzig. 50 pfg.

Professor Ihmels in fifty pages discusses what he regards as the problem of the daily forgiveness of sins in the Christian life. The problem may be stated thus: Where there is an actual personal renewal in Christ and a consequent genuine break with sin on the part of the renewed man, why is it necessary that there should be constant repetition of the prayer for forgiveness? The renewed man is not still a sinner yet he prays for forgiveness. The answer to the question is found in the continued consciousness of sin even on the part of the Christian. The flesh is still a mighty power yet it is being overcome gradually by the Spirit of God working in the believer. The Christian's fellow-

ship with God is not a once-for-all completed and perfected thing. It is a growing fellowship. The daily forgiveness of sins is a necessary factor in the Christian's unfolding life. The objective remission secured through Christ's atonement is in no Christian life completely realized subjectively as entire freedom from sin. Forgiveness is grounded in Christ and mediated by him, but progressively appropriated by the growing Christian. Professor Ihmels always writes with evangelical fervor coupled with scientific accuracy and spiritual insight. He knows the Christian heart as few moderns who have a highly developed scientific faculty know it. This little volume is a fresh proof of the fact.

E. Y. MULLINS.